

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE application of critical methods to the study of the Old Testament has brought about a change in our thinking which is properly enough described as a revolution. But there is a greater revolution to come. It will not come to the men who passed through the change wrought by the Higher Criticism. The same generation is never required to change its most cherished ideas twice. It is the men who are now passing into the pulpit, the men who have been taught the critical study of the Old Testament and have never known another, who will be called upon to return to the Old Testament, and it may be also to the New, at the demand of a new Science which the teachers of their youth may never have named in their hearing.

That new Science is Psychology. The revolution wrought by Psychology, we say, will be greater than the revolution wrought by criticism. For two reasons. Criticism affects documents: psychology touches men. Criticism is possible of application, and even of comprehension, by the few: psychology is intelligible to every one. And when it is understood it will be applied to the Bible as readily and as sweepingly by the uneducated Sunday School teacher as by the most advanced scholar.

Let the subject of study be the third chapter of Exodus. Criticism tells us whether the chapter,

or what portion of it, belongs to J, E, or P. The Sunday School teacher does not care two straws about J, E, or P. But psychology says that the Lord did not appear to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; for God was no more perceptible by the human eye in the days of Moses than He is perceptible now. It asserts that He did not call to Moses out of the midst of the bush and say 'Moses, Moses,' because God was no more audible to the ear of man then than He is audible now. The Sunday School teacher is arrested at once. If he is ignorant he is brought up all the more sharply. He cannot continue to teach the story of Moses' call as he has been accustomed to teach it. He has either to shut his mind to the things which psychology says to him, or pass through a revolution.

There is not much literature on the subject yet. We mean on the application of psychology to the Bible. And such literature as exists is mostly in magazine articles. But we must remember that magazines are likely to have far more influence with the coming generation than they had with the past. One volume, however, has been published. Its author is Mr. Jacob H. Kaplan, Ph.D. It has been published in America, where part of it had already appeared in the *American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education*. Its title is *Psychology of Prophecy: A Study of the*

Prophetic Mind as manifested by the Ancient Hebrew Prophets (Philadelphia: Greenstone; \$1.50 net).

Dr. Kaplan has a chapter on 'The Prophetic Call.' It is the first of a series of chapters in which he deals with 'peculiarly prophetic elements that require explanation in the Psychology of Prophecy.' The chapters which follow it deal with premonition, revelation, dream, vision, audition, ecstasy, and inspiration. The chapter on the Prophetic Call is the most momentous of them all. In the course of it the author touches the call of Moses.

But first of all, Dr. Kaplan emphasizes the fact that the Prophet of Israel was called. Leaving aside for the present the manner of the call and the explanation of it, it is patent, he says, that there was a moment in the life of the prophets, one and all, when they became conscious of a call from God to the office of prophet. He refers to Moses, to Samuel, to Amos, to Jeremiah, to Ezekiel, to Isaiah. Even Hosea, with all the perplexity of it, had no doubt whatever that he had received a call. And we have no doubt. For in spite of the wonder that it should have come from the Holy One of Israel (a call expressed in the words, 'Take unto thee the wife of whoredom, and the children of whoredom'), it was only the assurance that it did come from God that made the prophet obedient.

So psychology will not deny the fact of the prophetic call. The revolution it will work will not reduce the prophet of Israel to the level of a Greek rhetorician. It is no figure of speech, no trick of style, that makes Isaiah say, 'Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?' There is nothing of which Dr. Kaplan is more sure than that psychology will not deny but rather establish such experiences in the life of Isaiah or of Moses. So far as the fact of a call is concerned, the prophets remain on that mountain-top of God's nearness which they have always occupied. They will not be brought down. Let psychology be scientifically used, and

it will be found no leveller. What it will be found to do is not to bring the prophet down to the level of common men, but to make common men consider whether they have received a call to their work in life similar to the prophetic call.

'At the age of twelve,' says Dr. Kaplan, 'I was taken from school and devoted myself to a business career in my father's business. For six years I was in that business, occasionally "turning aside to see" longingly, without the slightest hope or idea, however, that I should ever be called to a student's life. No means and no opportunity presented themselves. One cold winter evening I visited all alone the German theatre. The music made me sad. I felt oppressed, alone and miserable. All the inheritance of my ancestors was suddenly awakened into life, and in a very serious and sincere sense of the word I felt the call to the higher life. I cared not what it was, but something it had to be, something that would unveil the mysteries of the world, prepare me to be a student, a helper and a guide among people. That night I walked home several miles in deep snow and was assured—I felt certain, I was determined—that I would become a student, though the opportunity and the means for obtaining that end were as vague as are my opportunities at present for becoming King of Prussia. From that moment to this the ambition and the hope has never for a single moment left me that I would be a student, a teacher, and a helper among men.'

Is that a call? Is that the call of a prophet? Let us leave the question unanswered. We cannot get all our questions in a new Science answered in a day. Let us leave the question unanswered, in case too soon we dare to take a place beside Isaiah in the purification of the lip, or even beside Hosea in the clash of moral emotions. There is an earlier question and a simpler. Why can we no longer teach that the Lord spake unto Moses out of the midst of a bush?

The poetical answer is, in Mrs. Browning's words,

that 'earth's crammed with heaven, and every common bush afire with God.' But we said that Moses' call is not rhetoric; and it is not poetry. It is experience. It is life. And psychology comes not to turn poetry into prose, but to tell us how it came to pass that Moses could speak of His call in such language.

Now, the first thing that psychology enables us to see is that there is an Eastern attitude to God, and there is a Western. There is an Eastern attitude. It is the attitude of immediacy. It does not recognize secondary causes. The men of the East do not need towers by which to climb to God. The Orientals who said, 'Go to, let us build us a city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven,' were faithless to their fatherland as well as to their God. They would imitate the ways of the West. The men of the East need no tower. They clasp hands with God. Did the voice come from a teacher? from the reading of a book? did it come to them out of the silence of their own heart as they journeyed by day? or in a dream by night? When they tell the story of it, they tell it in such words as these: 'God called out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses.'

That is the first thing. And it is very great. It is the first great step in that revolution which is to take place in the attitude of men's minds to the Old Testament. It is not an entirely new thing. Five-and-twenty years ago a brilliant young Scottish scholar, of the name of Peter Thomson, who was closely associated with Robertson Smith, and of whom scarcely less was expected—twenty-five years ago, Thomson contributed two articles to the *Expositor* on the indifference of Orientals to secondary causes. And the characteristic has occasionally been recognized by other scholars in the interval. But now psychology comes with the authority of Science, with the influence of a science becoming almost too rapidly popular. No longer will it be a scholar here and there calling attention to an overlooked fact in the interpretation of the

Bible. It will be worked out in many books. It will become the subject of innumerable magazine articles. Unless the new knowledge is wisely guided and well restrained there is danger that the call of Moses and of Isaiah may be taken to be nothing more than an ordinary experience of life coming to an unscientific mind and expressed in the illustrative language of the East.

That would be a revolution indeed. Think of it. The call of Isaiah which has been to countless generations of men the occasion of their first thrilling sight of themselves standing unclean in the presence of a holy God; the call of Moses which had been their first clear summons to take up the duty that lay immediately to their hand and do it—the call of Moses and the call of Isaiah resolved into Oriental hyperbole! Psychology has come, not to bring such a catastrophe to pass, but to save us from it.

It does not reduce the call of Moses to the way in which an Eastern tells us that he chose his profession. Psychology insists upon it that when a man is called of God, whether Eastern or Western, he knows that the choice has been made not by himself but by God; and that what he enters upon is properly spoken of not as a profession, but as a calling. Psychology may not deny that God is ready to call any man, to call every man. It denies that every man is called. For the second thing is that before a man is called of God he must be competent to undertake the work for which God calls him, and he must be able to hear the call.

He must be competent to undertake the work. Dr. Kaplan believes that there is a prophetic temperament and a prophetic training. He is probably right. But let us not make mistakes here. The minister need not be 'a son of the manse'; the prophet may never have entered the schools of the prophets. God's idea of temperament is larger than ours. It includes the temperament of a Jonah as well as the temperament of an Amos. And if He usually moves slowly, some-

times He acts with lightning rapidity. He does not always wait for the training of the schools. The most that we can be sure of is that in every case there is a psychological moment, and that God knows that moment. He waited forty years for Moses in Egypt, and forty years more in Midian. Then the bush burned and was not consumed. The psychological moment had arrived. *Moses turned aside to see.* When God saw that Moses had turned aside to see, He called him.

And Moses obeyed the call. That is necessary also. Did he obey it reluctantly? His reluctance does not pronounce him unfit. It was the reluctance of humility. It was due to a sense of the greatness of the calling. Moses obeyed the call, simply because he was in sympathy with God's purpose in calling him. I have seen, said Jehovah, the affliction of My people which are in Egypt. Moses had seen it too. Forty years ago he had lifted his hand to deliver them from their bondage. Forty years ago; and all the while that he kept the sheep of Jethro, his father-in-law, in the desert of Midian, he had had time to think of it. We spoke of training. He had not forgotten it a single day. And now when God called he was ready. He took the rod in his hand and went down into Egypt.

Under the title of *Psyche's Task*, a title calculated at least to awaken curiosity, Professor J. G. Frazer has published 'A Discourse concerning the Influence of Superstition on the Growth of Institutions' (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net).

Superstition has been called to the bar of judgment, and Professor Frazer appears as its advocate. It is not a bad thing? It is bad, he says, irretrievably bad. He says it is 'a hoary-headed offender.' The sentence of death must be passed upon it. He appears as its advocate, but he appears at night. 'At Athens cases of murder were tried before the Areopagus by night, and it is by night that I have spoken in defence of this

power of darkness. But it grows late, and with my sinister client I must vanish before the cocks crow and the morning breaks gray in the east.'

Now this is not the first time that an advocate has appeared to plead the cause of a client upon whom, if he had been judge, he would have pronounced the sentence of death. He has appeared as the advocate because he was well paid for it. But no mercenary motive affects Dr. Frazer. If he comes forward as the advocate of superstition, it is simply, but singularly enough, because he believes that in this world there are times and circumstances in which the bad may be better than the good. Superstition is bad. It is the lie of which religion is the truth. And it is all a lie. Nevertheless in the history of the world and throughout great spaces of its history, superstition has been the mainstay of that respect for Government, for Private Property, for Marriage, and for Human Life which is necessary to their well-being.

Now, Government, Private Property, Marriage, and Human Life are good things. Some regard for them is essential to the very existence of civil society. By strengthening them, superstition has rendered a great service to humanity. And Dr. Frazer comes forward, not to whitewash the character of superstition, not even to plead for a remission of the death-sentence—for he holds that the death-sentence is overdue—but to plead that the despatch may be without indignity. For in God's hands even superstition has been the instrument of great good in the world.

Take Government. And take the Melanesians. Among the Melanesians the government belonged to the Chief, and all security for good order rested upon the awe which invested his person. The person of the chief was sacred. It was hedged in by a magic circle of tabu. It might not even be touched. What gave the person of the chief this sacredness? It was the superstitious belief that he was in correspondence with the Unseen,

and that to approach so near to his person as to touch him was to incur the wrath of those unseen powers who watched over him.

The superstition was sometimes grosser than that. Among the Maoris the chief was believed to be a living god. He himself believed it. 'Think not,' said Te Heu Heu, the great Taupo chief and priest, shortly before he was swallowed up by a landslip, 'think not,' he said to a European missionary, 'that I am a man, that my origin is of the earth. I come from the heavens. My ancestors are all there. They are gods and I shall return to them.'

So sacred was the person of a Maori chief that it was not lawful to touch him even to save his life. 'A chief,' says Dr. Frazer, 'has been seen at the point of suffocation and in great agony with a fish bone sticking in his throat, and yet not one of his people, who were lamenting around him, dared to touch or even approach him, for it would have been as much as their own life was worth to do so. A missionary, who was passing, came to the rescue and saved the chief's life by extracting the bone. As soon as the rescued man recovered the power of speech, which he did not do for half an hour, the first use he made of it was to demand that the surgical instruments with which the bone had been extracted should be given to him as compensation for the injury done him by drawing his sacred blood and touching his sacred head.'

Now all this is superstition. And superstition is bad. But persuade these people that their chief is as other men are, and his power vanishes. With his power vanish law and order. In Fiji, says Mr. Basil Thomson, the first blow at the power of the chiefs was struck unconsciously by the missionaries. Neither they nor the chiefs themselves realized how closely the government of the Fijians was bound up with their religion.

It is an interesting situation. How do men

regard it? The passing adventurer looks at it, perhaps he interviews the chief, who sulks in his tent,—for the passing traveller is not to be accused of receiving superficial impressions,—and then he comes home and demands that the Maoris be left alone. What have the missionaries done? They have driven the unclean spirit out of a man, out of many men. That is not denied. The men are there as evidence. They are clothed and in their right mind. But what of the respect for law and order, and especially for private property? The Gergesenes prayed Jesus to depart out of their coasts, and He departed. For He was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But His command to His followers now is not to depart.

Messrs. George Bell & Sons are the publishers in this country of a manual of *Ethics* (8s. 6d. net), which has been written by two American scholars, Professor John Dewey of Columbia University, and Professor James H. Tufts of the University of Chicago. It has been, we think, for some time the deliberate intention of American scholars of the highest reputation, to break down those stiff walls of partition which have so long separated the study of Ethics from the study of Religion. In this volume the walls are laid even with the ground. We do not know that we are passing from one room to the other. Religion and Ethics live together in a single airy chamber, to the great advantage and enlightenment of both.

There is a chapter on the Hebrew Moral Development. It is no surprise that Religion and Ethics are found enlightening one another in that chapter. But it is significant that in a scientific manual of Ethics such a chapter should be found. And it is yet more significant that there is no hesitation whatever in showing that the influence which Religion had upon Ethics in ancient Israel was the determining factor in the separation of that nation from all the other nations of the world, and the means by which the promise made to Abraham, that in his seed should all the

families of the earth be blessed, has actually and undeniably been fulfilled.

The point of departure is the Covenant. What is it that to a savage makes an act right or wrong? It is custom. The tribe does this, or forbids that to be done. Their fathers did it, or did it not. The power to enforce the laws of custom will likely belong to the chief. But even the chief does not make them. He is himself as much under their authority as any man. Now custom may have been originally the result of experience. It may have been found that an occasional period of abstinence was necessary for the health of the community, and that certain rites of initiation, with their amazing severity, helped the young men and women to endure hardness. But custom prevents growth. Under new circumstances, some forms of abstinence may become hurtful to the health. Initiation may become wanton cruelty. But to the protest of the missionary the answer is a helpless *non possumus*. Our fathers did it. To the end of time we must do as our fathers have done.

When Moses came down into Egypt he found the Israelites in the grip of custom. But he carried in his hand a Covenant. It was a thing of religion. There was a God in it, and the name of a God. What religion the Israelites in Egypt were professing as they went out to the brickfields in the morning, or what influence it had upon their moral life, we cannot tell. But when Moses came down into Egypt with the Covenant in his hand, we know that from that moment those Hebrew slaves occupied the first rank among all the nations of the world, both in religion and in morality. It was the Covenant that did it.

The Covenant did its work gradually, no doubt. It did not make this stiffnecked, flesh-lusting, slave-hearted people, the most religious or the most moral people in the world all at once. 'Forty years long' is the bitter reproach of their long-

suffering leader. But when Moses came down into Egypt with the Covenant; when they agreed to let the customs of their fathers go and accept Jehovah as their God by a mutual understanding and engagement, they took that step which in time placed them visibly in front of all other peoples, civilized and uncivilized; until at last, in the fulness of time, out of a little town of theirs, a byword of insignificance, there came the highest we know in Religion and in Ethics, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man.

For the Covenant was an engagement made between two persons. From the moment that an Israelite accepted it he decided whether an action was right or wrong, not by comparing it with the customs of his fathers, but by referring it to the personal will of Jehovah. 'I am the Lord thy God—thou shalt not.' And when the Israelite had time to reflect upon it, he found that everything must be referred to the personal will of God, to whom he stood personally responsible. Not the ritual of worship only, but also his treatment of his fellows. And with the generalization of a great religious genius, a genius begotten of the Covenant, he said all religion is comprehended in this one word—thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and soul, and strength and mind; and in this other word is all morality comprehended—thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

It was not all at once. At first Jehovah was Lord of Hosts. He led the army of the Israelites in war and gave the victory. If He was jealous of the interference of other gods with His people, He seemed willing to confine Himself to Israel and leave other nations to serve their own gods. And the conditions of the Covenant were extremely simple. If the Israelites kept the commandments of Jehovah, and especially the commandment to have no other gods before Him, then He undertook to give them victory over their enemies and abundant outward prosperity, every man sitting under his own vine and under his own fig-tree

in a land that flowed with milk and honey. As yet no question was raised whether His commandments were right or wrong. It was enough that they were His commandments.

But now we see the greatness of the Covenant. It was a free engagement on either side. Nothing is more striking than the way in which Joshua emphasizes this and insists upon the people recognizing it. 'Now therefore fear the Lord, and serve him in sincerity and in truth; and put away the gods which your fathers served beyond the River and in Egypt; and serve ye the Lord. And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, *choose you this day whom you will serve*. . . . And the people said unto Joshua, Nay, but we will serve the Lord. And Joshua said unto the people, Ye are witnesses against yourselves that *Ye have chosen you the Lord* to serve him. And they said, We are witnesses' (Jos 24¹⁵⁻²²).

Now, to conceive of the relation between God and people as due to voluntary choice is to introduce a powerful agency towards making morality conscious. The Israelite has exercised his own will in the choice of Jehovah to be his God; he will certainly take the further step, and examine Jehovah's commands to see whether he is to obey them because they are the commands of Jehovah, or because they are true and right. This is the point at which the Israelites depart from the nations round them.

For the Babylonians had their god also, and obeyed his commands. But they never were able to say, 'The judgments of our God are true and righteous altogether'; they never got beyond saying they are the judgments of our god. And so when calamity fell upon a Babylonian he accepted it as punishment for sin. He might not be able to tell what sin he had been guilty of. The fact that he suffered was evidence that his god was angry with him. And he felt his guilt, one is compelled to see, as keenly as any Israelite. The penitential psalms of the Babylonians express the deepest

conviction of sin and the utmost desire to please the Babylonian god. But the Babylonian psalmist is often in the utmost perplexity as to the nature of his sin. He feels remorse, though he does not know that he has done wrong. And the possible failure to repeat a formula aright is as heinous an offence as manslaughter.

This is the position of the three friends of Job. And here, it is possible, we have a way of determining the date of the Book of Job, a date so amazingly disputed by experts. The book is written at a time and under circumstances which made it, as we should now say, a burning question whether calamity is evidence of guilt. If, then, as is now so generally held, the Israelites learned most of their Babylonianism in the Exile, the Book of Job would belong to that or a closely subsequent period. For the Babylonians had no doubt whatever that calamity spelt sin. Job's three friends, excellent men, a Temanite, a Shuhite, and a Naamathite, cannot admit a doubt of it. But Job is an Israelite. His is the Covenant. He cannot feel remorse for sins which he has not committed, and he refuses to repent of them.

As God liveth who hath taken away my right,
And the Almighty who hath vexed my soul;
Surely my lips shall not speak unrighteousness.
Till I die, I will not put away mine integrity from me.
My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go (27¹⁻⁶).

What is the solution? The solution is that the Covenant between Jehovah and Israel is not a mere material bargain, so much prosperity for so much observance. On the one hand, the service of God is not confined to outward acts. On the other hand, God's love for man (which never fails to respond to man's love for God, and even anticipates it) expresses itself not entirely in warding off outward calamity, but in causing everything to work together for good to them that love Him.

Nor was this the highest reach to which the Covenant engagement attained. The one admirable element in the primitive notion of tribal custom was the sense of common interest which it sent

through every member of the tribe. The Covenant takes up that element into itself and transfigures it. Perhaps the average Israelite was all his life content with a covenant of give and take; so much religious service for so much outward prosperity. Perhaps a few thinkers reached independently the higher conception of a prosperity that included the loss of all things, and of a service that expressed itself best in a broken spirit and a contrite heart. But only a religious genius (forgive the modern word) like Isaiah, could reach the sublimity of an innocent man taking upon him the calamities of other men, and even (marvel of marvels) actually carrying their sin. But that also was due to the Covenant. It was a natural, and with God to guide, an inevitable outcome of the engagement into which Israel entered with Jehovah, that day they said 'We are witnesses.'

Is there a still greater thing that can come out of it? Not on the part of Israel. Israel has exhausted the possibilities of the Covenant on the human side when it has found a man of whom it can say, 'Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.' But on the part of God there is. St. Paul puts it into words, 'God made him, who knew no sin, to be sin for us.' To be sin—it is not that. Isaiah discovered that. Who knew no sin—it is that. Even Job who held fast by his integrity, in face of the calamity which had swept over his house, never claimed to be, or hoped to find in this world, one who knew no sin. God found Him. God sent Him to give His life a ransom for many. In His unspeakable gift God made known what had been His purpose when He made a Covenant with Israel, and said, 'I will be your God.'

The Tests of Life.¹

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. J. IVERACH, D.D., ABERDEEN.

THE Kerr Lectures have won for themselves a position second to none, among the lectures of our country. From the first lecture by Dr. Orr down to the latest by Mr. Law, the Kerr Lectures have reached a high level, and have taken their place among the books which must be read by students. The former series were philosophical or theological, or dealt with subjects on the borderland of both. Mr. Law has made a new departure. He has made a book of Scripture the subject of his lectures, and as he has treated it, he has made a wise choice. From whatever point of view we regard these lectures they are admirable. If the reader desires an exegetical study of the First Epistle of St. John, Mr. Law gives him in the exegetical notes at the end of the volume a series of studies in which the wealth of modern learning is exhausted, and the exact meaning of words and phrases is set forth with a fulness and vividness

which leaves nothing to be desired. Does the student desire to know what can be said regarding topics belonging to Introduction proper, then his desire is amply gratified in the chapters given to that discussion. Authorship, date, readers, and so on are discussed with ample learning, historical knowledge, and critical judgment. Is he interested in theology? in the elucidation of special ideas peculiar to, characteristic of the Epistle? or in the concatenation of these ideas, then the main part of the volume is given to the satisfaction of that desire.

There are other features of interest in this admirable volume. There is the wide learning which has taken note of all the relevant literature which has clustered around this Epistle, throughout the ages. There is no parade of learning, no ostentation in the reference to books, but a student can see behind every paragraph the wide reading and the anxious pondering of a man who has resolved to leave nothing unransacked which could help him in his arduous task. Best of all the author has not allowed the material

¹ *The Tests of Life.* A Study of the First Epistle of St. John. Being the Kerr Lecture for 1909. By the Rev. Robert Law, B.D., Minister of Lauriston Place Church, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 7s. 6d. net.

gathered round the Epistle to come between him and the Epistle itself. He wears his learning lightly, he is determined to come into direct contact with the Epistle itself. There are signs that he has brooded over the Epistle, given his days and nights to it, until it has become, as it were, part of himself, and what he sends forth to his readers has become a vital part of his own experience. He has lived in the Epistle, and he speaks forth what his own life has won. We do not know anything better even on this Epistle, and when we write so we remember Rothe, Candlish, and the wondrous work of Dr. Watson of Largs, along with such commentaries as those of Westcott, Haupt, and the luminous recently published work of Dr. Findlay. These Lectures occupy a distinguished place in the literature of the Epistle, and will keep that place for a lengthened period.

As to the Lectures themselves we wish we had a larger place to note the various features of them which would justify a lengthened notice. There is the analysis of the Epistle, which deserves commendation for its thoroughness, its lucidity, and its exhaustiveness. It takes full account of everything, and neglects nothing in the Epistle. It takes full account of the peculiarities of thought and diction of the sacred writer, and traces the connexion of thought and feeling in a way which is persuasive and convincing. The opening chapter, called *Style and Structure*, is too condensed to suffer further condensation at our hands. But the condensation has not interfered with lucidity. One of the most admirable features of the book is the absolute clearness of the style, and the admirable lucidity of the arrangement. The remarks on style and structure are full of learning and insight, and prepare the way for the exposition which follows. We find that this chapter is a real help towards a right understanding of the Epistle. Exact historical knowledge appears in the chapter on the *Polemical Aim of the Epistle*. This chapter tests the historical knowledge of the author. For it supplies a test as to his insight into the conditions of the time in which the Epistle has been written. Does he know, can he appreciate the various forces at work in that seething and creative time in which the Epistle was written? Can he measure them? Estimate their value and their influence? What has he to say about Græco-Roman culture, about other influences at work at that time when all the separate streams of ancient

civilization met in the unity of the Roman Empire? One finds that here, too, Mr. Law has worked and thought to purpose, and the chapter is luminous and instructive.

Equally good is the chapter on *The Writer*. Since the rise of historical criticism this has been a bone of contention. It has been keenly contested, and the contest still goes merrily on. Some have, indeed, ceased to discuss it, and calmly take for granted that the Johannine writings are the product of an Ephesian school at the beginning of the second century. Others contend that the Apostle John was the writer. Into the contest we do not enter. But we say that the readers of this volume will find themselves in the hand of one who has read, thought, meditated on the question, and has come to conclusions which he can defend on reasoned grounds. He has put much in a few pages. His reasons and conclusions will be found in the book itself, and readers will find them satisfactory. But the main strength of the author has been directed towards the elucidation of the doctrines and the teaching of the Epistle, and in this attempt he has been singularly successful. It will be well to give the names of the topics which he successively discusses. The doctrine of God as life and light, the doctrine of God as righteousness and love, the doctrine of Christ, the witnesses to the doctrine of Christ, the doctrine of sin and the world, the doctrine of propitiation, eternal life, the test of righteousness, the test of love, the test of belief, the doctrine of assurance, the growth of Christian experience, eschatology, and finally the relation of the Epistle to the Fourth Gospel. In connexion with some of these topics, there are some additional notes, dealing with difficulties which seemed to the writer to need further elucidation.

While particular paragraphs form the starting-point of his expositions, and are dealt with in some fulness, yet the plan of the writer is not to give us a continuous commentary on successive sections of the Epistle. His plan is to take a particular topic, *e.g.* the doctrine of God as Life and Light, and to trace that doctrine through the whole Epistle. He notes the broad and general statement in which the doctrine is first expressed in the Epistle, and then follows it throughout the Epistle, noting its development, its varying uses and applications and qualifications, until the whole doctrine as it stood before the mind of the Apostle

is fully and clearly stated. The method has its advantages; it also has its drawbacks. If, on the one hand, it enables the author to trace the main thought through all its spiral ascents, and into all its relations with other conceptions, it sometimes hinders him from doing full justice to the thought in itself, and in its majestic entrance into the Epistle.

To pass from that, we notice as worthy of the reader's attention the masterly discussion on the theme God is Light. What is the meaning of the term? Mr. Law asks, does it refer to Essence or to Revelation? He had shown that light is used in the Scriptures in both meanings, and then he continues: 'For the interpretation of the Epistle, it is of some importance to determine with which of these ideas, essence or revelation, St. John's conception of the Divine Light comes into line. In my judgment it is with the latter. That God is light expresses the self-revelation of God: First, as a necessity that belongs to His moral nature; secondly, as the source of all moral illumination. But while maintaining this interpretation, I must admit that the exegetical authorities, almost with one voice, declare for the opposite view, namely, the Light here denotes the essential Being of God. "It is the innermost, all-comprehending essence of God, from which all His attributes proceed" (Haupt); "Absolute Holiness and Truth" (Huther); "The Absolute Holiness of God, especially as love" (Rothe); "the new idea of God as unconditioned Goodness, holy Love" (Beyschlag); "the love which constitutes the essence of God" (Grill).

'To this whole class of interpretations there is only one objection—a serious one, however—that they are irrelevant to the context' (pp. 58-59). Mr. Law is not daunted with the weight of authority against his view, in fact this independence of judgment, and fearlessness of the weight of authority against him when he believes he is right, is one of the noteworthy things in the book. It seems to me that he is right in his interpretation, and we recommend his readers to follow him in his detailed justification of his view. Support might be had for his view from the great American divine, Jonathan Edwards, to whom Self-Communication was the essential characteristic of God. Perhaps a better word than self-revelation to express what Mr. Law means would be the word used by Edwards, namely, that of Self-Communica-

tion. It is something more than self-revelation, or rather self-revelation is a step towards the self-communication of God, which may be looked at as the goal of all the activity of God. It is not possible for us to follow into detail the luminous exposition of this thesis, God is Light, but we commend it to the careful study of our readers.

The other discussions are also worthy of the deepest study. We invite special attention to the Excursus on the Correlation of Righteousness and Love, appended to the chapter on the Doctrine of God as Righteousness and Love. We call attention to this excursus as it reveals in Mr. Law qualities which throughout are rather kept in the background. In the main parts of his book he is expository, he is Biblical, and theological so far as regards the particular theology of this book of Scripture. In this excursus he reveals himself as a thinker and a theologian of no mean order. The excursus manifests such qualities and such possibilities, that we look forward to just such work as is here as the main contribution which Mr. Law is fitted to make to modern theology. If every age has to write its own theology, we look to Mr. Law to take a prominent share in the rewriting of theology for the immediate future.

There are many topics which invite notice and discussion. We might have noted the admirable chapter on the Doctrine of Christ, and the worthy discussion on the Doctrine of Propitiation. But we may not linger on these, but we lay particular stress on the chapter on The Growth of Christian Experience, which is valuable in itself, and noteworthy as a contribution to the theology of St. John. The concluding paragraph we quote: 'To take as starting-point the gift of God in Christ, the forgiveness of sins and the knowledge of the Father, then to advance, with this as our strength and the Word of God as our weapon, to faithful and victorious warfare; finally through this, to arrive at the sure perception of the Everlasting, in union with Whom our human life and its results become an eternal and blessed reality,—such is the curriculum which St. John here maps out for human experience. It is well to remember the alternative to this—the experience which teaches with equal intensity the illusiveness of all good; which writes "vanity of vanities" upon the life of man and all with which it is concerned; which proclaims, as the sum and end of all wisdom, that "The world passes away

and the lust thereof," because it has not "known Him that is from the Beginning," nor that "whosoever doeth His will abideth for ever."

Lastly, there is the masterly chapter on Eschatology, on which we should like to linger. All we can do in this relation is to quote: 'Even of this body of flesh and blood the soul is, in wonderful measure, the sculptor. Faces are made pure by purity of heart. Strength and nobility sit upon the countenance, when high resolve and heroic endeavour fill the mind. There is a calmness of feature which is an index to peace in the soul; a dignity and beauty which patient suffering alone gives; and when some strong tide of the spirit is sweeping through a man's heart, it alters the fashion of his countenance, causes his very form and figure to dilate, and makes the weakest like an angel of God. These facts, so far as they go are a prophecy, and, indeed, a beginning of that final transfiguration by which Christ "shall fashion the body of our humiliation into the likeness of the body of His glory." The very idea of a spiritual body is that it perfectly represents the character to which it belongs. As the material body is strong or weak, comely or uncomely, according to

the animal vitality, so is the spiritual body according to the spiritual vitality that animates it. The outward man will take the mould of the inward man, and will share with it in its perfected likeness to the glorified manhood of Jesus Christ.'

It is significant of the spiritual life of to-day, that the writings of St. John are gathering to themselves more and more of the study and devotion of our time. Is it too much to say that the theology of the present is becoming more and more Johannine? We remember how Principal Rainy in his later years dwelt with increasing devotion on the writings of St. John. His thought and his life were passing more and more under the thought and life depicted in the Johannine writings. Twice from the Moderator's Chair, once in the Union Assembly, and once when he was Moderator during the time of stress and strain, he quoted as his highest word to the Assemblies the concluding verses of this first Epistle of St. John: 'We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and Eternal Life.'

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION I. 10.

'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.'

THE SITUATION.

St. John is about to tell how he received the messages for the Seven Churches in Asia. He mentions the place, the condition, and the time, bringing them close together by the use of the same preposition. He was in (*ἐν*) the isle that is called Patmos—that is the place. He was in (*ἐν*) the Spirit—that is the state or condition. And it was on (*ἐν*) the Lord's day—that is the time. We have to do with the state and the time.

THE LANGUAGE.

1. *I was*. The verb he uses is not the verb to be (*εἶναι*), but the verb to become (*γενέσθαι*). We cannot easily express it in English. If it were

an event we could say 'it came to pass that.' But as it is a person, we can only use a phrase like 'came to be' or 'found myself in'; or else simply say 'was,' leaving the distinction unexpressed.

Does the past tense mean that he was no longer in Patmos? Not necessarily, but probably it does.

2. *In the Spirit*. To be 'in the Spirit' (with *εἶναι*) is the normal state of the regenerate man, just as to be 'in the flesh' is the state of the unregenerate (Ro 8⁹). But here (with *γενέσθαι*) it is a higher state than the normal, the state of the prophet, under special inspiration, for some special purpose. There are, indeed, four states to be distinguished. First, two of the unregenerate man, his normal state of being in the flesh (Ro 8⁹), and his abnormal of being possessed with an unclean spirit (*ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ*, Mk 1²³). Second, two of the regenerate man, his normal

state of being in the Spirit; and his supernormal state of coming to be in the Spirit, such a state as St. Paul was in—‘while I prayed in the temple, I was in (R.V. ‘fell into,’ ἐγέβετο) a trance’ (Ac 22¹⁷). The return to the normal state is spoken of as ‘coming to oneself.’ The prodigal ‘came to himself’ (Lk 15¹⁷); Peter ‘came to himself’ (Ac 12¹¹).

3. *On the Lord’s day.* This has been explained in more ways than one. (1) Easter, the annual feast-day observed by the Church in commemoration of the Resurrection. (2) The seventh day of the week or Sabbath. These suggestions have little to say for themselves. (3) The Day of judgment, as in Jl 1¹⁵ 3¹⁴. Hort (*Apocalypse i. to iii.*, p. 15 f.) prefers this meaning, ‘though with some doubt.’ He thinks it suits the context best. Swete, however, feels that it is foreign to the context; and it is certainly contrary to usage.¹ (4) The first day of the week. This also has the usage of the language against it,² for the adjective employed by St. John occurs only once elsewhere in the N.T., in 1 Co 11²⁰, where it is used by St. Paul of the Lord’s Supper (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον). It used to be thought that St. Paul coined the word and gave it currency in the Church. But it has been found in the papyri in the sense of ‘pertaining to the Lord’ (that is, the Emperor), ‘imperial.’³ But very early in the history of the Church we find the first day of the week called the Lord’s day. The earliest occurrence after St. John is in the Didache; after which it appears with increasing frequency. It is impossible to say that it was first used by the writer of the Apocalypse, but it is remarkable that its earliest occurrences are all in Asia Minor.

THE SERMON.

To do a thing well we must get into the spirit of it. Even to enjoy a thing or profit by it we must be in the spirit of it. And everything has its own spirit.⁴ The commemoration of a great victory is nothing to one who has not the spirit of the patriot. Shakespeare’s birthday is kept by those

¹ The Day of the Lord elsewhere is ἡ ἡμέρα (τοῦ) κυρίου (1 Th 2², 2 P 3¹⁰); cf. ἡμέρα χριστοῦ (Ph 2¹⁶).

² Elsewhere the first day of the week is (ἡ) μία (τῶν) σαββάτων, or πρώτη σαββάτου (Lk 24¹, Jn 20^{1,19}, Ac 20⁷, 1 Co 16²).

³ See Deissmann in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. (1907), p. 206, and in *New Light on the New Testament*, p. 82.

⁴ See Matheson, *Side Lights from Patmos*, p. 3.

who have the spirit of poetry. Darwin’s centenary is commemorated by those who have the spirit of scientific investigation.

It is told of the widow of Schumann, the musical composer, that whenever she was going to play any of her husband’s music in public she would read over some of his old letters to her, written in the lover days. Thus, she said, his very life seemed to fill and possess her, and she was better able then to interpret his work.

One Sunday morning my way to church led me through a street of respectable working-class dwellings. At one of these a man, in his shirt sleeves, was bidding good-bye to a visitor. As they parted he said, ‘Well, good morning, I’ll go in and read my *Tit-bits*!’

A Glasgow minister has told of a man of his acquaintance who was an inmate of one of the Poorhouses,—a man of spirituality and true refinement. ‘I don’t know how you can live in Stobs-hill,’ said a friend who visited him one day. ‘I am not living in Stobs-hill,’ was the gentle but dignified reply, ‘I am living in God.’

St. John was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day. It was a spirit in keeping with the Lord’s day. It was the spirit of the Lord’s day. A mere note of time is not in his manner. Our subject, therefore, is the Spirit of the Lord’s day. What is it?

I. *It is a Spirit of Victory.* For the day was associated in the Seer’s mind, first of all, with the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. And the great fact about the Resurrection was that it was a victory over sin and death. It is easy to see that it was a victory over death. He rose from the dead. But death, in the teaching of Christ, and afterwards to the mind of the Apostles, is not the death of the body. To be dead is to be ‘dead in trespasses and in sins.’ ‘She that liveth in sin is dead while she liveth.’ The sting of death is sin, and the devil has the power over it. Christ submitted to physical death that He might taste the sting of death. But it was not possible that He should be holden of death. It was not possible: because just in dying He gained the dominion over sin, and so inevitably rose again from the dead. To be in the spirit of the Lord’s day is to stand upon the triumph of Christ over sin and death.

When General Wolfe was mortally wounded at the battle of Quebec he said after his third injury, ‘Hold me up: do not let my brave boys see I am wounded.’ A little later, as his blood was fast ebbing away, he said in faint tones, ‘The victory is ours! Oh, keep it!’

This day my Saviour rose,
 And did inclose this light for His;
 That, as each beast his manger knows,
 Man might not of his fodder misse:
 Christ hath took in this piece of ground,
 And made a garden there for those
 Who want herbs for their wound.

The rest of our creation
 Our great Redeemer did remove
 With the same shake which at His passion
 Did th' earth and all things with it move.
 As Samson bore the doores away,
 Christ's hands, though nail'd, wrought our salvation,
 And did unhinge that day.

The brightnesse of that day
 We sullied by our foul offence:
 Wherefore that robe we cast away,
 Having a new at His expense,
 Whose drops of blood paid the full price
 That was requir'd to make us gay,
 And fit for Paradise.

Thou art a day of mirth:
 And where the week-dayes trail on ground,
 Thy flight is higher, as thy birth.
 O, let me take thee at the bound,
 Leaping with thee from sev'n to sev'n,
 Till that we both, being toss'd from earth,
 Flie hand in hand to heav'n!

GEORGE HERBERT.

II. *It is a Spirit of Revelation.* For the first day of the week was associated, next, with Pentecost. (1) It is a revelation of the past. There were many things which the disciples did not understand until Jesus rose again from the dead. Nor could the Spirit be given until Jesus was glorified. It was promised, however, that then He would bring to their remembrance what Jesus had said unto them. The resurrection, as interpreted by Pentecost, was a revelation to them of *Jesus Himself*, His words, His acts, His person. It was a revelation to them of the *Father*. The veil of the Temple was rent in twain, for God may no longer be hidden away in mystery. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' And it was a revelation of *themselves*. They were ambitious to know which of them should be greatest. Now they understood what greatness meant, and what the cup contained which they had first to drink. (2) It was a revelation of the future. The Spirit was sent not only to call to remembrance but also to show the disciples things to come. Moreover, on this occasion St. John

was in the Spirit in that fuller measure which gives larger vision and makes a man a Seer. And the business of the Seer is to reveal the future as well as throw light on the past. The light thrown on the past was for the sake of the future. St. Luke speaks of the Third Gospel as a history of the things which Jesus *began* to do and teach. The Book of Acts is a history of the things which He continued doing and teaching after the Ascension. The Apocalypse (whatever theory of interpretation we allow) is a history of the things which He is doing and teaching while He is with us still, even unto the end of the world. The Seven Churches are your church and mine, and you and I are their Angels. The Apocalypse itself may be called a revelation of the future, in the light of the past, for the use of the present.

III. But the Spirit of the Lord's day is also a *Spirit of Christian Response*. There are three channels into which the response may run.

1. REST. Not rest of body merely. That is better obtained every night in sleep. And to spend the first day of the week in bed is not to be in the spirit of the Lord's day. Nor is it rest of mind merely. To transfer the attention from buying and selling and getting gain to visiting picture galleries, playing games, and getting amusement is not to be in the spirit on the Lord's day. The day is properly called a day of rest when it is made a day of quiet, confident response to God. On that day the first disciples received their pentecostal gift. The 'tongues as of fire' were as the 'coal from off the altar' which touched the lips of Isaiah, taking away their iniquity, filling them with a sense of God's presence, making them ready to say, 'Here am I, send me.'

2. WORSHIP. As the question of a day of rest in seven for the body belongs to a different order of things from that which we are considering, so also we do not discuss the question of special times and seasons for worship. We are to pray without ceasing. Yet we will have our hours of prayer. And since worship implies not only fellowship with God but also fellowship with one another, it is necessary to have times of worship in order that that fellowship may have an outward expression in the meeting of the saints. Only let it be understood that worship is not in the observance of days or the regulation of forms, but in fellowship with God as a holy God, and with one another as saints of God, a fellowship that

may be partly silent, but ought certainly to join audibly in the song of the seraphim, 'Holy, Holy, Holy.'

He who had had the greatest fulness of Christian hope and Christian service,—he says 'I was in the island.' You know what that means, you people who have an insular experience of loneliness here to-day, whom nobody loves and nobody sympathises with, who seem to have to go to heaven on a single line, no one before, none to follow, none at the right hand, none at the left. That is all he says about his loneliness; and a verse or two after he says 'I was in the Spirit.' That will do; for he that is in the Spirit is joined to God. He is not lonely any more; he is not separated any more; and his pains are over and his isolation is done, and what he begins with when he says in the first chapter of the Apocalypse, 'I was in the Spirit,' is only the first sentence of what turns out to be a great ladder which runs right up into heaven itself.

J. RENDEL HARRIS, *Union with God*, p. 146.

3. SERVICE. The response of the Christian to Christ's victory over sin, and to the illumination of the Holy Spirit, expresses itself not only in quiet confidence or rest in God, and not only in united worship, but also in service. The final response is, 'Here am I, send me.' And the Lord's day should be fuller of service than any day of the week. More actual work should be done, since it is work with a more abiding value. And it should cost more. It is easy for some men to enter into the spirit of their work

on the other days of the week. To enter into the spirit of the work of this day is to be crucified with Christ. But it is work done in the spirit of the Lord's day that has its reward. Come ye blessed, inasmuch as ye did it.

Some one once asked Quintin Hogg, the founder of the Polytechnic Institute in London, who had devoted a great fortune to that enterprise, how much it cost to build up such an institution. 'Not very much,' was Mr. Hogg's reply, 'simply one man's life blood.'

Some years ago a Swedish cook in the kitchen of a friend of mine, moved by an appeal which she had heard in her church, gave herself as a missionary to China, and went off to that distant land. Years passed. The Boxer Rebellion broke out. She returned for a short visit to the town where she had lived in America, and went to see the mistress for whom she had worked as a servant. The lady did not recognize the sweet-faced dignified woman who had called upon her, until she told her name. Then as she looked into her face, she could hardly believe it was the same person who years before had been her servant. Her face was transformed into a new beauty as she told of her work and of her purpose to return, now that the Rebellion was over. To the lady's suggestion of the imminent danger, she said: 'O, they are my people. I love them and they need me.' And as, with simple and unquestioned sincerity, she told her purpose and showed her heart, my friend said that her face shone with the very image of Christ. Her loving self-forgetting service had already changed her into His likeness.

The Religious-Historical Movement in German Theology.

BY THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., EDINBURGH.

IV.

WHAT, then, is the picture of Jesus and the Gospel which remains as the result of this pure historical inquiry? Let us take it as it is presented to us in the pages of Bousset's *Jesus*—perhaps the most popular of the *religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*. Jesus comes before us there as 'the child of his time and his people.' His figure is the noblest and most perfect that has appeared on the plane of history, but even He 'never outstepped the limits of the purely human.' 'Throughout his life he placed himself on the side

of men, and not on the side of God.' Even if He did claim Messianic dignity—that is denied by Wrede, but allowed by Bousset—yet He never made Himself the object of faith. All passages in the gospel in which Jesus appears as demanding faith in Himself are explained as due not to Jesus Himself, but to the dogmatic convictions of the community, working upon and colouring the tradition. The founder of the Christian religion He is in this sense only, that He is the first subject or illustration of the Christian faith in God the Father, and 'we are taking from Jesus no honour to which he himself would have laid claim when

we refuse to acknowledge his Divinity.' His gospel of the Fatherly Divine Love is presented by Jesus, it is said, in complete independence of any idea as to His own personal place in the scheme of Divine redemption. On one point Bousset is emphatic: 'One thing certain,' he says, 'is, that Jesus never conceived or expressed the thought that God's forgiveness of sins depended absolutely upon his own sacrificial death or upon a vicarious atonement rendered by that death.' 'In his preaching we find no trace of the dogma of the atonement.' The only condition of salvation that Jesus recognizes is ethical trust in the fatherly love of God and obedience to His commandments. 'This do, and thou shalt live.'

Such are the conclusions which, it is claimed, are arrived at by a disinterested historical study of the facts and that true *feeling for reality* ('Wirklichkeitsinn') which is the fundamental requirement of a scientific theology. What are we to say to them?

The contrast between the teaching of Jesus (as presented in the Synoptics) and that of Paul we must admit. In Jesus we look in vain for any such developed doctrine of His Person and work such as we have in Paul. But that need not dismay us. Jesus, it has been said, came not to preach the gospel, but that there might be a gospel to preach. Or to express the same truth in more scientific language, the nature of the cause only becomes apparent in the effect. That is the essential truth in the Ritschlian position that the Revelation given in Jesus Christ can only be rightly apprehended when taken in connexion with its effects in the thought and life of His followers. The Christ of apostolic faith is no extraneous addition to the Jesus of gospel history, but only the explication of the true nature of that fact. 'We can discover the full compass of His historic actuality only from the faith of the Christian community.'¹ It is indeed an unjustified exaggeration of this truth to make, as Kähler does, the apostolic witness *in its whole extent* normative for faith in all ages. This is a danger from which Ritschl himself, under Biblicist influence, is not free. In the working out of his dogmatic he is always eager to take up into his system in the completest form possible the entire apostolic doctrinal formulation. Much in this, however, is only of relative historical worth,

¹ Ritschl, *Justification and Reconciliation*, iii. p. 1 f.

conditioned as it was by the psychological atmosphere and historical situation of the time. The Christian faith is never synonymous with the Christian theology of any one time; and is not therefore to be identified with the *Pauline* theology. 'As theologians we are the product of our time, as Christians we are the product of God.'² But granted Paul's dependence on current conceptions for the form of his theological formulation—for example, a certain view of man which is not specifically Christian in origin; a certain view of sin, its origin and consequences; a certain view of history; supposing, even, that the Christianity of Paul were 'syncretistic,' in the sense that a certain pre-existing Messianic dogmatic was taken up and applied to Jesus, the question remains, why was this predicted of *Jesus*, the man of Nazareth, and that too of a crucified Jesus? The predicates may not have been new, but their predication of this subject certainly was new, and in the new copulation they received a new, an incommensurable significance. The fundamental principle of scientific thinking—a principle one might expect to see peculiar justice done to by a theology which claims to be in a special sense scientific—is the *Principle of Sufficient Reason*, that the cause must be adequate to the effect. Is the historical Jesus, then, whom these writers give us, such a person as to explain and justify the faith which the Church has built upon Him? The influence on the Pauline intellectual formulation of this faith of these other factors referred to need not be denied, but the more we minimize the figure of Jesus, and the less we make of the influence of the personality of Jesus on Paul, whether directly in his own religious experience or indirectly through the primitive Christian society, the more mysterious and inexplicable appears the apostolic witness as to the Person and work of Jesus.

On careful examination, indeed, we think, one cannot escape the conclusion that the picture of Jesus on the one hand; and that of Paul on the other, given by these religious-historical writers, is drawn, not from the study of history as such, but from certain philosophical *presuppositions* or 'speculative postulates' as to what that history should be. Bousset in his *Jesus* claims to be governed by the sole desire for historical truth and reality; but in his more recently published work *What is Religion?*

² Hermann, *Der Verkehr*, 4th ed. p. 8.

('Das Wesen der Religion'), we see the presuppositions behind which determine his historical presentation. The result of the thoroughgoing application of the historical method to religion is, he there holds, to destroy the halo of the 'supernatural' which had woven itself around Christianity. Everywhere a course of events is discerned which is *on the whole*¹ explicable by universal immanent laws. All forms a stream in which everything is mutually dependent. History nowhere shows us a place where a divine supernatural revelation in any specific sense took place. The whole is a natural-supernatural evolutionary process, in which all is Divine, yet all human. The belief in the Deity of Jesus, and in the miraculous, in any sense in which the whole process of religious history is not miraculous—this, Bousset holds, is opposed to our whole modern evolutionary mode of thought, and our changed views of the nature and working of God. And the Church must simplify its doctrine of Redemption, if it is to commend the gospel to 'the modern mind.' The effort of Bousset, and other members of the school, therefore, is directed to the attempt to reduce Jesus to the scale of other historical personalities. A prophet He was, a religious hero, or spiritual genius—the greatest indeed—but nothing more. Not only is the significance of Paul's testimony to Jesus minimized, but even in the Gospels themselves all is ruled out or called in question that cannot be brought within the common measures of humanity. Our Lord's claim to be the judge of the world, for example, is denied to be historically trustworthy. The saying that He would give His life a ransom for many is rejected, as out of keeping with the historical view of Jesus, and due, ultimately, not to Jesus, but to Paul, and the faith of the primitive Church. And in the story of the miracles only that is allowed as genuine which the modern mind, through its acquaintance with hypnotism and such-like facts, can accept as psychologically conceivable.

All this, however, is the result not of the application of the historical method as such (with its three principles of criticism, analogy, and correlativity), but of an unscientific or dogmatic use of these principles which settles beforehand the limits

¹ In the creative personalities of history, Bousset allows we have 'a mysterious force' which cannot be explained by immanent laws. So Troeltsch also.

of the historical—a proceeding which is not the less dogmatic that it styles itself 'non-churchly' or 'non-theological.' It is the dogmatism which takes scientific principles which have been found useful in one realm of knowledge,—changes these from being merely regulative into constitutive principles of the universe, and then, coming to the study of history with a certain preconceived notion of what history must be, rules out all evidence that might conflict with its point of view.² If Jesus be actually historical—such is the implicit logic of its thinking—if Jesus be a person who appeared in human history, He must be capable of expression in purely human terms. He must be a man like other men, the noblest and greatest it may be but yet one of a series, one more 'hero' or 'genius' added to the race.

It is true, indeed, that these writers are at times compelled, even against their philosophical principles, to do more justice to the historic facts. Bousset, for example, when proceeding in the spirit of genuine historical inquiry, assigns to Jesus a place, and makes assertions about Him, which cannot be justified on his evolutionary monistic theory of history. He acknowledges that Jesus is a leader 'with whom no other is comparable.' He speaks of His 'unique position,' of His 'super-prophetic significance.'³ He allows His sinlessness (a miracle in the moral world), and goes the length of recognizing that 'the life of Jesus, and with His life also His death, are facts which have a relation to the forgiveness of our sins.'⁴ Troeltsch too, though in general he holds that the predicate 'absolute,' as applied to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, is but a relic of the dogmatic method of the old churchly supernaturalism (a '*dogmatische Quälerei*'), recognizes again and again that Jesus is not only the highest that has appeared in the religious series, but is 'the highest conceivable.' We cannot think anything higher; we do not want anything more final, because, he says, 'in him we

² This philosophical dogmatism finds its boldest expression in the editor's 'Vorwort' to the *Volksbücher* series in which Bousset's *Jesus* and Wrede's *Paulus* appear. The fundamental principle governing the investigations of the series is, he says, 'the *inviolability* of the scientific method' ('die Unverbrüchlichkeit der wissenschaftlichen Methode, die alle Weltgebiete nach ihrer Besonderheit ordnet unter den gemeinsamen Regeln der Vernunft').

³ *Jesus*, p. 198 f.

⁴ *Die moderne Theologie auf der Hannoverischen Landessynode*, p. 14.

experience fellowship with God and salvation. 'To whom shall we go but unto thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'

The fact is, two contradictory motives may be traced working together in these writers. The one secondary and subordinate—the genuine endeavour, governed by a profound feeling for ethical and spiritual reality, to do justice to the facts of history and experience. The other primary and in general determinative—the philosophical or apologetic motive which seeks to make history the illustration of a certain preconceived theory, and argues, in effect, that because Jesus was a person who appeared in history, and history is the sphere of the relative only,¹ therefore Jesus cannot have the absolute significance which must attach to one who can be the *object* of religious faith, and is attached to Jesus throughout the New Testament. The starting-point, however, for Christian theology must be not a preconceived philosophical theory of history, but the historic Christ. It does not become our place in the universe to dictate the conditions under which alone history is possible. We must let the historical personality of Jesus make its own impression. The business of theology is not to *make*, but to *interpret* the facts of Christian faith and history; and that is the only 'scientific' method which fulfils the conditions necessary to the bringing out of the true nature of these facts.

Now this does not mean that we must approach the study of these facts without presuppositions. That Kant has once for all shown to be impossible, in any subject. What it does mean is, that we must come to the study of them with the fitting or appropriate presuppositions. The members of the movement or 'school' under discussion come to the interpretation of Jesus with presuppositions of a predominantly intellectual, æsthetic, pantheistic or rather 'panentheistic' kind, drawn from so-called 'modern culture'—the culture, *e.g.*, of Goethe and Bismarck which, governed by a certain conception of evolution, rules out the supernatural in Christianity, and preaches the gospel, not so much of ethical salvation or redemption, as of immanent self-realization or development. Theirs is the ideal

of the *Aufklärung* rather than of the Reformation. The fundamental mistake, indeed, according to Bousset, in the Pauline interpretation of Christianity, is that it is based on the opposition between sin and grace, that in the centre of it is placed the ethical-religious consciousness of sin. Jesus, however, is a fact not, in the first place, for the intellect—even when this is 'touched with emotion'—but for the conscience and the will; and only the mind that is steeped in conscience is in a position properly or adequately to interpret Him. The significance of Jesus, that is to say, is a saving significance, understood only by the man who knows what sin and guilt are; and the return to a truer view of Jesus Christ and His gospel is to be found not through the enlightenment of 'modern culture,' but first and foremost through an ethical awakening of mind and heart to the realities of sin and grace.²

Approached in this way Christianity becomes the one truly supernatural, ethical-redemptive religion—in Harnack's³ words, 'not one religion by the side of other religions, but *the* religion' beside which no other really is, religion in the final and absolute sense; 'and Christ not merely one Master by the side of other masters, but *the* Master,' unique and alone, in whom we have the Atonement. For it is as we know ourselves to be sinners redeemed through Him that we come to realize that He is not one of a class, that He is what no other can be, our SAVIOUR and our LORD. As He Himself declared: 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No man cometh to the Father but by me.' 'None other name wherein we must be saved,' that is the only Christian faith that is truly historical—a faith, not whose first and greatest *subject* merely, but whose *object* has been Jesus Christ, and any theory which fails to do justice to this fact stands self-condemned as an adequate interpretation of Christianity, as a matter either of history or experience. It may explain what

² Therefore, the true theology—the 'scientific' theology—must be a 'churchly' theology, not in the sense of corresponding to the teaching of any particular organization or body, but in the sense that it interprets and expresses the faith of the community of believers. Much that is said in the way of disparaging the Church and its doctrine is rooted in a false conception of what 'the Church' means on the one hand, and what . . . 'doctrine' means on the other.

³ *Die Aufgabe d. theol. Facultäten*, p. 16. This lecture of Harnack is important as recognizing more clearly than in *The Essence of Christianity* the central significance of the Person of Jesus Christ for Christianity.

¹ See *Die Absolutheit*, pp. 41, 74. This is the old Hegelian construction of history back again, a construction which found expression in Strauss' well-known dictum: 'Die Idee liebt es nicht, ihre Fülle in ein Individuum auszugießen.'

it conceives Christianity ought to be; it does not interpret what Christianity has been and is. And it is because in Paul we have, behind and beneath the thought forms of his time, the classic representation and interpretation of this saving significance of Jesus, that for a true conception of the Jesus of history our cry must be, not 'Back from Paul to Jesus,' but 'Back to Jesus through Paul.'

The aim which the religious-historical movement has set itself, viz. to recommend the gospel to 'the modern mind,' is one with which every good and honest heart must sympathize. A restatement of the Church's faith in terms more suited to modern thought—this is a crying need. For it cannot be denied that many at the present day are estranged from the Church, because of the Church's bondage to the doctrinal formulation of a past age. The Church—the believing community, that is—must assert and exercise its Christian liberty to state its faith as to the meaning and significance of Christ in terms more suited to the modern mind. And towards this restatement the new historical-psychological study of religions has helped not a little by calling men's minds back to the distinc-

tion between religion and theology—between the religious attitude of the soul to Christ, which we call faith, and the doctrinal formulation of the faith. But our quarrel with the movement is, that it gives us not so much a new theology as a *new faith*, a view of Jesus and His Gospel which is true neither to Jesus' own teaching nor to His apostolic witness, and is not the Gospel that sinners need.

In the religious-historical theology we have one more attempt—this time from the side of the historical-psychological science of comparative religion and mythology—to eviscerate Christianity of all that in it is unique or original, and, under the guise of doing right by the genuine historical character of Jesus, find its centre in that which it has in common with other religions. But we cannot accept from any theology, whatever claims it may make to the 'scientific,' a picture of the historical Jesus to which the only history we have bears no witness. Nor can we allow the Jesus whom the history we have does attest, to be dismissed from the world of historical reality on grounds which after all are not historical but 'dogmatic.'

In the Study.

LET NO MAN DESPISE THEE.

The Future Leadership of the Church is the title which Mr. Mott has given to a volume of lectures on the Christian ministry (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). The first chapter contains the problem. The problem is to find ministers and missionaries enough, and to find them of the right kind. One way is to make young men believe in the greatness of this calling. Mr. Mott quotes Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton University. 'The only profession which consists in being something,' said Dr. Wilson, 'is the ministry of our Lord and Saviour—and it does not consist of anything else. It is manifested in other things, but it does not consist of anything else.'

Mr. Mott believes that it is the home that makes the minister or the missionary. Professor Austin Phelps tells us how his father magnified his office: 'He honestly believed that the pastoral

office has no superior. To be a preacher of the Gospel was a loftier honour than to be a prince of the blood royal. So pervasive was this conviction in the atmosphere of our household that I distinctly remember my resolve, before I was four years old, that I would become a minister.'

But sometimes the eye is opened afterwards to the height of this high calling. 'Principal Rainy of Edinburgh not long before his death told me that the spiritual quickening he received at the time of the great Disruption turned him from his plan of being a physician and made him a minister. He added, "It woke me up. Religion became great in my eyes."'

THE SAINTS.

New Things and Old in St. Thomas Aquinas (Dent; 3s. 6d. net). Is there anything in this? Is there anything in it for the modern pulpit? Mr. H. C. O'Neill has translated certain writings

of the Angelic Doctor, and written a long introduction to them. The introduction is excellent, a useful addition to the literature of St. Thomas. There is no way of describing the contents of the book but by quoting one of the writings translated in it. The title of this one is 'The Saints.' It is an exposition of the words 'so great a cloud of witnesses' in Heb 12¹.

'Now the saints are called clouds, firstly, by reason of the sublimity of their conversation: "*Who are these that fly as clouds?*" (Isa 60⁸). Secondly, because of the fruitfulness of their teaching: "*He bindeth up the waters in his clouds, so that they break not out and fall down together*" (Job 26⁸), and likewise (36²⁷): "*He poureth out the showers like floods that flow from the clouds.*" Thirdly, by reason of the utility of spiritual consolation: for just as the clouds furnish refreshment so also the examples of saints: "*And as a cloud of dew in the day of harvest*" (Isa 18⁴). We have therefore this cloud of witnesses given us, since from the lives of the saints to some extent the necessity of imitating them is brought home to us. "*Take, my brethren, for an example of suffering evil, of labour and patience, the prophets*" (James 5¹⁰). "*As the Holy Spirit speaks in the Scripture, so also in the deeds of the Saints, which are form and precept of life to us*" (Augustine). (*Epis. to Hebr. chap. xii. lect. 1*).'

ANOTHER MISUNDERSTOOD TEXT.

"And so I remember how the same venerable elder, in reading Psalm ciii, paused after the words, "He will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger for ever," to expound the words as meaning that the Lord will not always limit himself to chiding, but will take much more decisive measures; nor will he much longer keep back his anger, but will launch his thunderbolts of wrath"—J. Alanson Picton, *Man and the Bible*.

PLAGIARISM.

The Muhammadan name for it is 'brand-seeking.' Professor D. B. Macdonald of Hartford has published his Haskell Lectures on Comparative Religion. Professor Macdonald says, 'I am neither metaphysician, psychologist, nor ethicist; I am simply a student of Arabic and of Islām who desires to suggest to those who are

metaphysicians, psychologists and ethicists some of the problems which lie for their science in that vast and so broadly unknown territory.' He discovers and discusses three things in Muhammadanism: first, the reality of the Unseen, that is, of a background to life unattainable to our physical senses. Second, man's relation to this Unseen as to faith and insight therein; that is, the whole emotional religious life ranging from a prayerful attitude and a sense of God's presence to the open vision of the mystic with all its complicated theological consequences. Lastly, the discipline of the traveller on his way to this direct knowledge of the divine and during his life in it.

But Professor Macdonald very modestly calls himself a borrower, and just misses calling himself a plagiarist. That he is not a plagiarist, we know. We know that he is no more of a borrower than he ought to be. Few men have done so much original work in Muslim theology or know so many of its texts at first hand. Yet he almost calls himself a plagiarist, for he opens his new book in this way:—

'You may remember how Robertson of Brighton used to say, speaking of his sermons and their inspiration, "I cannot light my own fire; I must convey a spark from another's hearth." The same idea and the same expression occur in Islām. Muhammad, following the usage and speech of the desert, tells (*Qur'ān*, xx, 10; xxvii, 7) how Moses left his family and went aside to the Burning Bush to seek from it a brand, a *qabas*, for their own fire. Thence *iqtibas*, "brand-seeking," persists in the rhetorical language of Islām, for such borrowing of fire from predecessors. Permit me, then, having both Christian and Muslim authority, to quote, by way of text for these lectures, a couple of sentences from Mr. William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*, that give very precisely the thesis which I propose to set before you as illustrated in Islām. At the beginning of his third lecture, when approaching the broad question of the reality of the Unseen, he says: "Were one asked to characterize the life of religion in the broadest and most general terms possible, one might say that it consists of the belief that there is an unseen order, and that our supreme good lies in harmoniously adjusting ourselves thereto. This belief and this adjustment are the religious attitude in the soul."

The name of Mr. Macdonald's book is *The*

Religious Attitude and Life in Islam (University of Chicago Press ; \$1.75).

ABOUT RESULTS.

Nothing better has been said about results than a saying of Mr. W. L. Watkinson's brought to light by the Editor of the *Christian World Pulpit* and now to be conveniently read in *The Art of Sermon Illustrations* by Mr. H. Jeffs (Clarke ; 3s. 6d. net) —by no means the only good thing in that book.

'We ought to know better than to despair over the visible result of spiritual endeavour. During a recent visit to Johannesburg I spent a day at one of the gold-mines. There was immense activity, gangs of workers, clouds of dust, hissing steam, deafening stamps, heaps of quartz, torrents of water and cauldrons of slime ; but I came away without having seen a single speck of gold. The engineer touched the bottom of a turbid stream, and exclaimed, "There is a particle" ; it was, however, as invisible to me as the same metal usually is on the collection-plate. Yet, when on the return journey our ship anchored at Southampton, we discharged boxes of gold-dust to the tune of a million. Thus to-day our evangelical work proceeds with noise of machinery, smoke and stir, sweat and blood, and a thousand things that are trivial and trying to the carnal eye, but the practical spiritual gain is often depressingly dubious (Isa 55¹¹).'

ABBA, FATHER.

I.

I. There are a few words in our English version of the New Testament which clearly do not belong to the English language. Without including words that are almost proper names, like Aceldama (Ac 1¹⁹), Gabbatha (Jn 19¹³) and Golgotha (Mt 27³³), they are such as corban (Mt 27⁶), mammon (Mt 6²⁴), raca (Mt 5²²), maran-atha (1 Co 16²²). The New Testament is written in Greek, and the Greek is translated into English. But these words are Aramaic, which is the dialect of Hebrew that was spoken in Palestine at the time of Christ, and as they have been preserved in the Greek New Testament in their Aramaic form, they have been taken over in that form into English. Among the most noticeable of these foreign expressions are three that occur in St. Mark's Gospel : Talitha cumi (5⁴¹), Ephphatha (7³⁴), and Abba (14³⁶). Let us look at the last example, Abba.

2. The word 'Abba' is found three times in the New Testament, in Mk 14³⁶, Ro 8¹⁵, and Gal 4⁶ ; and in each case it is followed by the word

'Father' (Gk. ὁ πατήρ). Now 'Abba' itself means Father ; so that to a person who could speak both Aramaic and Greek the meaning would be 'Father, Father' ; and the Syriac versions have actually found it impossible to avoid the repetition.¹ Why is it, then, that the word for 'Father' is given in all these three passages first in Aramaic and then in Greek ?

A number of interesting suggestions have been made.

1. Bishop Lightfoot thinks that our Lord in Gethsemane repeated the name 'Father' as an expression of the earnestness of His prayer, and that He gave it in both languages just because He was acquainted with both. He quotes an instance from Schöttgen of a woman who begins her intreaty to a judge in two words, one Aramaic, the other Greek, and both meaning 'my lord.' And then he recalls the other examples of doubles in the New Testament—Abaddon, Apollyon, in Rev 9¹¹ ; and satan, devil (*diabolos*) in Rev 12⁹ 20² ; and he finds in the combination 'a speaking testimony to that fusion of Jew and Greek which prepared the way for the preaching of the Gospel to the heathen.'² Sanday and Headlam in like manner think that our Lord, 'using familiarly both languages, and concentrating into this word of all words such a depth of meaning, found Himself impelled spontaneously to repeat the word, and that some among His disciples caught and transmitted the same habit.'³

Still more emphatically Salmond says : 'The double title is the utterance of deep emotion. Strong feeling is apt to express itself in reduplicating terms ; and in the case of those accustomed to speak at times an acquired tongue, it is the fond vernacular that springs first to the lips in moments of profound or agitated feeling.'⁴

If this is the explanation, the use of the repetition by St. Paul would be either some imitation of its use by our Lord in Gethsemane, or else a like spontaneous outburst of emotion in the thought of the new filial relationship to God which he had found in Christ.

On the supposition that the repetition is due to Jesus Himself, other explanations of it have been given, two of which are worth noticing.

¹ Although it is possible in other languages to leave the Abba simply untranslated as in A.V. and R.V., this has not always been done.

² *Galatians*, p. 169.

³ *Romans*, p. 203.

⁴ *St. Mark*, p. 328.

(1) 'Abba' was probably in the time of Christ, and certainly a little later, applied as a title of reverence to men as well as to God. Several of the Rabbis mentioned in the Mishna and Tosefta have this title¹ of whom the most distinguished is Rabbi Saul. There is a story in the Talmud² to this effect: 'There was a great drought in the land and the Rabbis sent the little children to Hanan the Hidden One, to ask him to pray for rain, and when the little ones came to him they said, "Abba, Abba, Father! Father! give us rain!" Hanan knelt in prayer and cried, "O Master of the World! For the sake of the innocent ones, who know not how to discriminate between the Father who giveth rain and the father who cannot give, but only ask for rain, hear our prayer!"'³

Now it has been suggested that Christ added the Greek word because it was necessary in order to give 'Abba' its unmistakeable application to God, and fill the word with its fullest reverence.

(2) On the other hand, Dr. E. A. Abbott⁴ points out that in Greek the article with the nominative when used in addressing a person is often vernacular and imperious, as addressed to a slave. While, therefore, it was possible to use the vocative of the word in the Greek (*πάτερ*) as is done in Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer (11², R. V.), it required the combination of the Aramaic and the Greek, or some other method of the kind, to give the Greek word its proper value when addressed to God. In that case, however, the repetition would not likely be due to Jesus, but would be added by the evangelist or some other.

2. The opinion has been held that our Lord did not repeat the word in Gethsemane, but that the repetition is due to transmission.

(1) The Greek might be an explanation of the Aramaic word inserted by the Evangelist himself, or found in his source, just as in other cases he adds the explanation of Ephphatha and Talitha cumi. But it must be observed that in these cases attention is drawn to the assertion by the words 'which is, being interpreted' or 'that is,' while here there is no such notice given.

(2) Bishop Chase has suggested⁵ that in each of the three occurrences of the expression there is a reference to the first clause of the Lord's Prayer. He thinks the addition of the Greek word is due to

the Evangelist and that the omission of such a phrase as 'that is' or 'that is, being interpreted' may be accounted for by its incongruity with the context. But his own opinion is that by the time St. Mark's Gospel was written the repetition had become a familiar form of words to Christians in prayer. Now if the Lord's Prayer began with the simple word 'Father,' as in St. Luke, Hebrew Christians would use the Aramaic word and Greek Christians the Greek; whereupon it would become customary to combine the two, and the Prayer might even be known by the combination, just as we call it the *Pater noster*.

(3) In any case it is now held by many expositors that by the time when St. Paul wrote and therefore, of course, when St. Mark wrote, it was customary for Christians to begin their prayer by using both words. It was almost a liturgical formula, just as at the end we sometimes say 'Amen, so let it be.'

II.

I. We have then, as to the origin of the 'Abba, Father,' a choice between two opinions. Either the repetition was due to our Lord in Gethsemane, or else it was due to the fact that the early Christians spoke sometimes Aramaic and sometimes Greek; and that in public prayer it became customary to open with the word 'Father,' according to Christ's command, and to express it at once in both languages. It is of little consequence which opinion we make ours. The important thing is that 'Abba, Father' occurs three times in the New Testament with a meaning which is the same every time but is not fully understood until the three occasions are studied separately and then brought together. The three occasions are these: (1) By Jesus in Gethsemane. The words are: 'And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt' (Mk 14³⁶). (2) By St. Paul, in writing to the Galatians. The words are: 'But when the fulness of time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father' (Gal 4⁴⁻⁶). (3) By St. Paul to the Romans. The words are: 'For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear;

¹ From 'Abba' comes the title Abbot with its cognates; and Kohler claims that the Church simply took it over from the Synagogue.

² See J. Kohler in *J. Q. R.* xiii. (July 1901), p. 567 ff.

³ In *Sanhedrin*, 113b, Elijah is called 'Abba Elijah,' and there is a curious story told of a certain Rabbi who accused him of being quick-tempered because of his treatment of King Ahab. Jastrow thinks that the title 'Abba' is used sarcastically, and Bacher translates 'Väterchen Elias.' But Kohler holds that he is called 'Father Elijah,' just as any other highly venerated Rabbi (*J. Q. R.* xiii. 579).

⁴ *Johannine Grammar*, p. 519.

⁵ *Texts and Studies*, vol. i. No. 3, p. 23.

but ye received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him' (Ro 8¹⁵⁻¹⁷).

2. Take the thoughts in order.

1. Here are all the persons concerned in redemption: (1) the Father, to whom the cry is made; (2) the Son, who makes the cry for Himself in Gethsemane; (3) the Spirit of the Son, who makes it in the heart of the other sons; (4) the sons themselves, who under the power of the Spirit, cry, 'Abba, Father.'

2. The cry is the cry of a son to a father. That in every case is the whole point and meaning of it. In one case it is the cry of the Only-Begotten Son; in the other cases it is the cry of the adopted sons. But it is always the cry of a son who has the heart of a son. An adopted son might not have the heart of a son. But in each case here the Father says, 'My beloved son,' and the son responds, crying, 'Abba, Father.'

3. The true heart of a son whereby we cry 'Abba, Father' is due to the gift of the Spirit. Look at St. Paul's argument to the Galatians. There he states two things: First, that when the fulness of the time came God sent forth His Son into the world; second, that because we are sons God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. Why did God send forth His Son into the world? He sent Him to make us sons. That is the whole purpose in a sentence. The Son fulfilled that purpose. He did not make us all sons, because we did not all receive Him. 'But as many as received him to them gave he the right to become sons.' Then, when we had become sons, God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. This is an additional gift. It is necessary, because without the Spirit of His Son in our hearts we should not be able to feel that we were sons, we should not be able to respond as sons, we should not be able to behave as sons. After Jesus rose from the dead He ascended to the Father. He had done the work which God had sent Him to do. To as many as received Him He had given the right to become sons, and they had become sons. But they were not conscious yet of their sonship. They were not conscious of it until that day, the day of Pentecost, upon which God sent

forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts. Then they became conscious of their sonship. They cried, 'Abba, Father,' and the place was shaken where they were assembled together. And they said to the rulers who threatened them, 'Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak.' Thus to the fulness of sonship two gifts are necessary—the gift of the Son unto the world to make us sons, and the gift of the Spirit of the Son into our hearts to make us conscious of our sonship.

3. What are the advantages of receiving the Spirit of God's Son into our hearts? That is another way of asking, what is the Spirit of God's Son?

1. *It is a spirit of knowledge.* We come to know God as the Son knows Him. Now the Son knows God as Father. God was not known as Father before Jesus came into the world. We must say that with full responsibility, and yet with emphasis. The relationship of father to son is applied in the Old Testament metaphorically to the relationship of Jehovah to the nation of Israel, and even to the individual Israelite. But it is merely a figure of speech. It is a rhetorical comparison; and in all the Old Testament there are only sixteen passages in which the comparison is used, while in the New Testament God is called our Father, or we are called His children two hundred and sixty-three times.¹ In the time of Christ the Jewish Rabbis were careful *not* to speak of God as Father,² but used some periphrasis in order to avoid it. The name which Jesus preferred to use, and which He taught His disciples to use, when addressing God was 'Father.' Dalman thinks it probable that He always said '*my* Father.' For no doubt He used the word Abba, speaking Aramaic; and properly 'Abba' is not simply 'Father,' but '*my* Father.' Therefore the Spirit of God's Son is the knowledge of God as Father, as my Father. And to address God as '*my* Father' is to receive new knowledge of God, with the sense of a new and wonderful experience.

When Paul says, 'Ye received the spirit of adoption, in which we cry, Abba, Father. The spirit itself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God; because ye are sons, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father'; and when John says, 'Behold what

¹ See the statistics set forth in Dr. James Drummond's *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 173 ff.

² Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 191.

manner of love the Father has given us that we should be called children of God'; it seems clear that the writers are referring to some new experience, which had imparted to their minds a holy exaltation, and awakened within them the consciousness of a hitherto unacknowledged relationship. The semi-panteistic absorption of the soul in the essence of God had become the conscious intercommunion of Father and child; philosophy had turned into faith; and to become a perfect son of God was not only the intellectual ideal, but the operative aim and purpose of life.¹

2. *It is a spirit of confidence.* This is the immediate result of the knowledge of God as Father. And it is the object of all Christ's teaching about the Father to beget this confidence. 'Fear not, little flock, your Father knoweth.' It is confidence both in His power and in His willingness. His power was recognized already. The God of Israel was known as the Almighty God. The Spirit of God's Son reasserts His power. 'Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee.' The new knowledge is that the Almighty God is a loving Father, withholding no good thing from us. When the leper came to Jesus, saying, 'If thou wilt, thou canst,' he recognized, like Nicodemus, that Jesus was a Prophet come from God, because He had the power of God. His hesitation as to Christ's willingness was due to his ignorance of God's Fatherhood.

3. *It is a spirit of liberty.* This is St. Paul's point, both in Galatians and in Romans. But there is a difference. In Galatians it is liberty from the bondage of the Law that he emphasizes; in Romans it is liberty from the bondage of the flesh, from sin and death. (1) The Spirit of God's Son is a spirit of liberty from the Law simply because it is a spirit of sonship. If there are slaves in the household they must be governed by laws—'Thou shalt not.' But who ever heard of a father drawing up a code of rules of conduct for his children? If they have the heart of children it is a heart of love; and they need no other constraint than the love of the father. It is a great point with the Apostle that the sons of God are not under law. He spoke and wrote often about it although there was so much to do in the way of making men sons. (2) But liberty from the law is not liberty to do the deeds of the flesh. The Spirit of God's Son is liberty from habits of

sin, even from any desire or motion towards sinfulness. It is the liberty that gives us courage to say in every temptation, 'Get thee behind me, Satan.'

4. *It is a spirit of obedience.* 'Howbeit, not my will, but thine be done.' My will?—Yes, because it is a spirit of liberty. The Son of God said, 'My will' in Gethsemane. And when the sons of God receive the Spirit of God's Son they can say 'My will' for the first time in reality. But 'our wills are ours to make them thine.' 'Not my will, but thine be done.' There is a cup put into our hands. We shrink from it. Shall we drink it? Our wills are ours. Yes, we shall drink it. We may say, and we may say it with something of the deep emotion of a Gethsemane, 'Abba, Father, let this cup pass from me'; but we shall add, 'Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done.'

In their great reprint of Wyclif's Bible, published in Oxford in 1850, Forshall & Madden give some illustrations to show the courage that was necessary to translate the Bible in Wyclif's days. From a manuscript volume preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, they quote the apprehension which one unnamed translator felt: 'Brother, I knowe wel, that I am holde by Crystis lawe to parforme thyn axinge, bote natheles we beth now so fer yfallen away fram Cristis lawe, that if Y wolde answere to thyn axingus, I moste in cas vnderfonge the deth; and thu wost wel, that a man is yholden to kepe his lyfe as longe as he may. And perawnter it is spedful, to holden oure pes awhile, tyl that God foucheth saf, that his wille be yknowe.'

I said, Let us walk in the fields;

He said, No, walk in the town.

I said, There are no flowers there;

He said, No flowers, but a crown.

I said, But the skies are black,

There is nothing but noise and din;

And He wept as He sent me back—

There is more, He said, there is sin.

I said, But the air is thick,

And fogs are veiling the sun.

He answered, Yet souls are sick,

And souls in the dark undone.

I said, I shall miss the light,

And friends will miss me, they say.

He answered, Choose to-night,

If I am to miss you, or they.

I pleaded for time to be given.

He said, Is it hard to decide?

It will not seem hard in heaven

To have followed the steps of your guide.

¹ Drummond, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 172.

The Nomenclature of the Parables.

BY THE REV. R. M. LITHGOW, LISBON.

THAT common denominator, by which we have been guided in our study of the parabolic symbolism, sheds light on other aspects besides this of the parabolic record and its doctrine. The fact it bears witness to, of a subject common to all the Synoptic parables, the development of which is traced throughout their whole sequence, gives us a unifying element, its relation to which should prove the distinguishing feature of each single parable. The history we have been following in these parables of our Lord is that of man's spiritual nature, from the point where it is only potential, or at most dormant, to that where it has attained its full development and glory, honoured with the fellowship, and entrusted with the authority of its Maker.

We might well expect that this would have been seen all along, and have its reality and importance kept before us, in the common designations, as well as in the popular expositions, of the several parables. As a matter of fact, however, the case is very far from answering to these legitimate expectations. Quite one-half of the Matthean parables, and a full third of the Lucan ones, are generally referred to by names, which distinctly withdraw our attention from the main and unifying point of their teaching. Our present purpose is to study this popular nomenclature, and to note its influence on parabolic exposition.

At the very outset we are confronted with what warns us to be careful in our criticism. For our Lord's first parable, although clearly picturing man's spiritual state in the several soils therein described, and expounded in this sense by its divine Author, is referred to by Christ Himself as the Parable of the Sower. It is one of two designated by name in the New Testament, the other being that of the Tares. There is this common to them both, that they were spoken at the very outset, and so prior to any development, of the parabolic teaching. Appearing thus, these parables might the more readily be named after the leading figure, or special word, which their several narratives present.

It is, however, only the first of them to which their Author Himself gives its name. And as it

opens with the sower going forth to sow, so the other which immediately follows, opens with a man sowing good seed, and his enemy thereafter sowing tares in his field. Now it is these two sowers who make possible every element in the parabolic doctrine. But for the Sower of the good seed, and that enemy who sows the tares, the whole atmosphere and environment of man's spiritual development would disappear. There is then a special fitness in Christ's drawing attention, by the designation He applies to His first parable, and by the way in which He opens His statement of the second, to these the great opposing forces in that spiritual world to which all His parables relate, and the contrast between which is the special subject of their opening triad.

These two initial parables are distinguished in having Christ as their first expositor; and, in as far as relates to the former of them, the divinely authentic interpretation has been generally followed by all expositors since. And consequently this parable has as a rule been expounded in relation to the several soils it sets before us. Thus Dr. Bruce says it is meant to teach that there are diverse classes of hearers, corresponding to the four sorts of ground; while Dr. Dods regards it as explaining why the good seed fails so frequently to fructify, by showing that this depends upon the nature of the soil upon which it falls.

The same good guidance has not been so generally followed in regard to our Lord's interpretation of His second parable, that of the Tares. Christ distinctly says in His exposition of its imagery, 'The field is the world,' but the perversity of expositors, even good ones, has led them to maintain that this field is the Church. The spirit of the Old Testament chronicler, whose whole view of his nation's history is coloured by the ecclesiasticism of Jerusalem, lives in the view of this parable taken by Augustine, Luther, and Beza, not to mention others, and retained by several modern expositors. It was the exigencies of a desperate position that led the Donatists to maintain the other view, which, with his strong good sense, Dr. Dods has accepted. It is enough

for us that we have its Author's clear exposition in favour of regarding this parable as having reference to those influences for good or evil which characterize the whole field of humanity, and thus have a wider range than any Church on earth, although the contrast between them is here set in that full light which the coming of the Son of Man has brought to bear upon the kingdoms of light and of darkness.

There is a premonition of the many ecclesiastical controversies with which the interpretation of this parable has become associated, in the fact that its original hearers have shown, by the designation which they gave it, how far the trying tares had got a foremost place in their minds. When, similarly affected, we substitute here an uncalled-for guidance on the treatment of heretics for the plain warning of the parable in regard to the evil influences affecting us all every day, we clearly miss the point of the parable. And we cannot say but that its ancient designation, by diverting attention from the two sorts of seeds, has had its share in producing this result.

But whether this be so or not, there can be no doubt that the Net of that third parable, whose immediate connexion with the initial two, others have recognized before us, has proved a snare for more than one excellent theologian. It is the spirit of a narrow-sighted ecclesiasticism that causes Dr. Trench here, as in the case of that tare-sown field, to see but the Church, where a much wider net, that of humanity itself, is clearly indicated. But why Dr. Bruce should tilt against the sane judgment and common sense of Grotius, in contending that the net is the kingdom, is not so easy to understand by those who have felt the inspiration of his wide unconventional outlook and wise spiritual insight. For surely it is the deadening blight of the letter that, in the formula, 'the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net,' is put forward, to eclipse the sunlight of Christ's own expository reference to the end of the world. But here, again, one must not overlook the fact that this parable of the good and bad Fish has not yet got rid of its puzzling entanglement with the net. If owing its position in the Matthean record to its symbol, that of course must be the fish, but it is possible that its distinctly eschatological reference may account for its postponement here, till after parables with more relation to the course of man's life on earth.

The Matthean parables of growth have not, like those of the great distinction, caused any misapprehension of their meaning through their names. There has been but some slight difference of terms, too, in their exposition. Thus, while the Mustard Seed for Dr. Trench is Christ, for Drs. Bruce and Dods it is the kingdom; and while for the former the Leaven is the gospel, for the latter divines it is the Christian morality and spirit, affecting the world through personal influence. Mark's Parable of the Growing Corn has had its true place and value assigned it by Dr. Bruce, but why Trench and he should severally put so much weight on the secrecy, and sourness, associated with the growth here depicted, as to designate the parable in view of these features, is not so easy to appreciate. The point of the parable is to portray the development of the kingdom in the individual, as the growth of the mustard does that of the visible Church, and the diffusive potency of the leaven that of the Christian spirit. Now Growing Corn as a name denoting the growth of good seed, seems best to meet all the needs of the case.

We meet with misleading names again, in the next group of the Matthean parables, in the cases of those of the Hid Treasure, and the Pearl of Great Price. For it is the Treasure Finder, and the Pearl Merchant on whom we must fix our attention, to read aright the lessons taught us here. It is man's finding and winning of the kingdom, that is the subject of these parables, as it is these actions, rather than the value and nature of either the treasure or the pearl, which are here described. And in the latter of the two parables, the usual formula itself puts us on this the right interpretation, for it reads, 'the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant, seeking goodly pearls.'

The conventional designations have, however, led expositors to extract as much as possible from the little that is said about the thing found or sought for, to the neglect of what is plainly told us about the seeking. The mention of a field in the earlier parable again enables Dr. Trench to get a sight of the Church, although his conscience seems to trouble him lest this should prove to be the Bible. In every exposition of these parables, full justice and more is done to every glint of light shed upon the Treasure, and the Pearl. Fortunately there is no serious difference, if any,

as to what these represent, the kingdom and its value, nor can these parables be expounded at all, without some fair share of justice being done to the active agents who figure in them. But it shows how entirely apart from their place in the development of the parabolic doctrine they have been treated, to note that Dr. Dods says their purpose is to exhibit the incomparable value of the kingdom of heaven, and that Dr. Bruce sums up their meaning as the kingdom of God the *summum bonum*, in both of which cases we see that it is the Treasure and the Pearl, rather than the Finder and the Merchant, that are most considered.

It is the light got from Matthew's next parable, that most encourages us in the view we take of these two. For here, in this Parable of the Unmerciful Servant, or Unforgiving Debtor, as Dr. Dods prefers to call it, we have a third parable on finding, here conjoined with again losing, which beautifully crowns and interprets the other two. It proclaims grace to be the thing found, and in furnishing us with a condition of its retention, draws our attention to the conditions of its procural too. That, in our judgment, is the main point of the preceding parables, explaining, as it does, the need for the purchase of a field, in connexion with an already discovered treasure.

Now in view of this, it is distinctly interesting to note how these two sets of conditions, those of the getting, and of the keeping, are associated in the expositions given of this parable. Thus Dr. Bruce regards the implacable spirit as not only justly forfeiting, but as precluded from any receipt of mercy; Dr. Trench says of the forgiven man, that in showing mercy he renounces no right, having pledged himself on asking and accepting grace to show it. And Dr. Dods finds this parable proclaiming in the plainest language, that the mere cancelling of our guilt does not save us, and that unless the forgiveness of God begets within us a truly gracious spirit, we cannot be owned as His children.

It is such expositions as these, showing how close is the connexion between what relates to the finding and the forfeiting of grace, which enable us to see how suitably this Parable of the Unforgiving Debtor follows that of the Pearl Merchant, and to appreciate how much underlies that parting with all, required in order to the purchase of the

treasure-field and of the pearl. But it would seem as if the connexion, between this, the last of the Galilean parables, and the two earlier finding ones, had escaped expository notice.

The Matthean parables on the divine claims, or man's duties towards God, are, like those on growth, in no way misleading, through their ordinary titles of the Labourers, the Two Sons, and the Husbandmen or Tenants. For it is in these several relationships that the human soul is at this point represented. And hence we prefer the Labourers as a title, to that of the Hours, given this parable by Dr. Bruce.

The expository treatment of these parables attests our contention, that, with the finding group, we step from the sphere of morality and law into that of grace. Thus Dr. Bruce notes that it is the spirit of the service, rather than the amount of work done, that is held of account in the payment of the labourers, in keeping with which Drs. Trench and Dods find the parable directed against mercenary service, and the bargaining spirit, in man's dealings with his Maker. Again, in the Parable of the Two Sons, Dr. Bruce finds a rebuke of insincerity, and Dr. Trench one of a vain self-righteous profession, while Dr. Dods regards it as commending deeds not words, all alike thus emphasizing its call to a hearty loyalty to God as man's loving Father. And so, too, with the third parable of this group, for all three expositors regard the conduct of the husbandmen as representing man's abuse of the divine trust. Trench says it sets forth the despite done to Jehovah by His favoured people; Bruce that it portrays the truculent ill-treatment of Jesus by the Jews; and Dods that it represents the selfish perversion of sacred duties and official dignity, on the part of men set to maintain and further God's own cause.

The parables of the Wedding Feast and Robe, of the Ten Virgins, and of the Talents, which close the Matthean record, are all somewhat misleading in regard to their titles. The Royal Wedding Guests and the Intruder, the Bridesmaids, and the Trading Servants, are designations which would better indicate their relation to the parabolic doctrine as a whole, for, as we have pointed out, it is the complimentary relationships which these terms denote, with the duties they imply, which constitute the subject of their teaching. Dr. Trench passes censure on the

Wedding Garment, as a faulty name, for the first of these parables, and himself calls it the Marriage of the King's Son, although both names alike divert attention from the real point of the parable. We note with interest Dr. Trench's observation that in these later parables the deity ever figures in a higher rôle. He is thus in turn Employer, Father, Landlord, King, Bridegroom, and Supreme Lord. This is the only contribution to our own view of the parables which we have come across, and we hail it as adding a confirmatory point which we had missed.

Our modern expositors have not failed to do justice to the several notes of warning, in regard to the contempt and abuse of grace, the lack of vigilance, and the neglect of active Christian duty, which these solemn parables afford. Just as the word Virgins led Chrysostom and others strangely astray in their exposition of this parable in the early ages, so has the oil in this parable proved a stumbling-block to some modern expositors, and Dr. Bruce has rendered a good service in showing that it ought to be regarded as a symbol of the means of grace, rather than of grace itself. No less has the wedding robe given rise to various and conflicting interpretations. Theophylact's words 'that the entrance to the wedding-feast being of grace is without scrutiny, but not so the life of those who have entered,' sheds most light on this matter, and shows such interpretations as faith, or charity, to be but partial expressions of what is better denoted as a gracious and righteous disposition, or a character worthy and recognizant of divine grace. Dr. Trench, true to his predilections, finds the Church here doubly symbolized, alike in the bride and in the guests of this wedding-feast. His comparison of the over-confidence of the bridesmaids, and the under-confidence of the unprofitable servant entrusted with the talent, has more to commend it, while Olshausen's remark that 'while the children of darkness are cast into eternal fire, the children of light are cast into outer darkness,' serves to remind us that it is the duties and responsibilities of grace that are set before us in these last three parables.

Turning now to the Lucan record, we find nothing to criticize in the designations of the lost and found parables. Complaint has been made that their main feature as a notable evangelic utterance would be more fitly denoted by the titles of the Good Shepherd, the Good Woman, and

the Good Father. But such names, we can see, would be out of keeping with the unity of the parabolic doctrine. Besides, in view of the divine standpoint from which they regard man's natural condition, we prefer the names, Lost Coin, Lost Sheep, and Lost Son, even to those of the Strayed Sheep, and Prodigal Son, which have more relation to the human side of this subject.

In regard to their exposition, we note that our modern divines seem to be at one, in identifying the elder brother of the Lost Son with the Pharisee, while Trench stands suggestively alone, in considering the woman of the Lost Coin as a symbol of the Church, with her candle representing the Bible. We have our doubts about this strange honour done to the Pharisee, in view of the father's words, 'Son, thou art ever with me,' and since making acquaintance with Mr. G. O. Barnes' suggestion of the Trinity being represented in the agency of the three-one parable, have been no less fascinated by the view that the woman represents the Spirit, than convinced that the Good Shepherd, and the Heavenly Father, are severally represented in the two companion parables.

One is at a loss to understand why the prayer parables, of the Midnight Borrower, and the Importunate Widow, should have come to be so much better known as those of the Friend at Midnight, or Selfish Neighbour, and of the Unjust Judge, as the latter two figures have at most but the impersonal significance of a frowning providence, and are invariably utilized expositively on the score of their unlikeness to the Hearer and Answerer of prayer. It is clearly the petitioners here, as also in the Parable of the Pharisee and Publican, whose conduct furnishes the lessons which these parables are intended to teach. In connexion with their exposition, we note that Dr. Trench does not miss the chance of finding the Church symbolized by the Importunate Widow, an amusingly suggestive and dubiously complimentary similitude.

The parables of the Two Debtors, the Good Samaritan, and Dives and Lazarus, belonging to the typical rather than to the symbolical class of parabolic utterances, give us examples, rather than symbolic pictures, of the effects and fruits of grace, as also of the ungracious character and its fate. They in fact translate into actual life and

experience the figures of Matthew's finding group of parables, revealing in the needs of a robbed and half-dead man, and of a leprous beggar, the real field in which a lasting treasure may be found, and exposing the disaster of neglecting such opportunities of manifesting grace, and winning an immortal prize. Their titles are in no way misleading nor unsuitable to their teachings.

The Lucan parables on the divine claims give us, in that of the Barren Fig-tree, one, the title of which fully explains itself, and a pair by no means so satisfactorily designated. These are the parables of the Pounds, and of the Unprofitable Servants, or of Extra Service, as Dr. Bruce has better named it. The Farm Servant would perhaps best designate the latter, and the King's Pedlars the former parable. For what is set forth in them is severally, the devotion of a hard-wrought but faithful attendant, and the duties of servants, who, with a very small capital, are set to trade by the master who becomes their king. The poor endowment in this case is clearly made with a view to testing the ability of his subjects, in order to their state employment, by the sovereign.

Expositors generally have recognized in the Barren Fig-tree, a symbol applicable alike to the Jews as a nation and to man's personal disposition towards God, although some have contented themselves with expounding it in the former connexion. The resemblance which the Parable of the Pounds bears, in some of its features, to historic incidents in the fortunes of the Herodian family, has led Trench here, as in the former case, to deal mainly with its Jewish bearings, while Dr. Bruce has well turned to account its more helpful personal ones.

The several names under which Drs. Trench and Bruce expound the Parable of the Farm Servant, serve well to show how the parabolic nomenclature may affect parabolic exposition. Trench's Unprofitable Servants is a parable describing, but not prescribing, duties which God might, but does not, exact of His servants. Bruce's parable of Extra Service shows how in the household of a gracious lord, no duties are held irksome or exacting, because a loving devotion is the cardinal virtue of all its members.

The story of the Rich Fool presents no less solemn a parable of judgment, than any of the final three in Matthew's Gospel, and on it many

an impressive sermon has been preached. Its teachings are obvious, its exposition easy, and its title suitable enough. That of the Great Supper represents no less forcibly the fate of those rejecting God's grace, than the other does that of those serving Mammon. Even more to the point than its suggested name of the Excuses, or the title it generally bears, would be that of the Recusant and Ready Guests, for it is the indifference of the former that is its main feature, as it is through the cheerful acceptance by the latter of a gracious host's invitation that we have a sunny side put upon this dark parable of doom.

In the name we give the Parable of the Unjust Steward, may be discerned something like a lack of that very sagacity which this parable commends. For thus absurdly designated, it has naturally given occasion for such misconceptions of its meaning, as found their extreme expression in the charges made against its attributed Christian teachings, by that philosophic but prejudiced apostate, the Emperor Julian. While Christ, by His use of the term unjust as descriptive of this steward, passes condemnation on his unscrupulous conduct, it is for his prudence and alertness that he is commended, as an example to be imitated by the servants of God. Clearly, then, the title of the Sagacious Steward would best suit this parable, and remove the ground for those misapprehensions to which its usual designation is fitted to give rise.

Matthew and Luke have each his respective introductory formula for the parables recorded by them, while Mark uses one which approaches that of Matthew. That of Matthew is 'The kingdom of heaven is like (or likened) unto,' and that of Mark, 'is as if,' while Luke begins, in more narrative fashion, with 'A certain man.' Four parables in Luke, one in Mark, and one in Matthew begin interrogatively; and two in Matthew, the Sower, and the Husbandmen, severally 'Behold,' and 'Hear,' while Mark in his report of the Sower parable begins with both these words. It is undoubtedly the general adoption of the first leading word after these formulæ to designate the several parables, that has occasioned the use of the misleading titles of which we have taken note, but it is the lack of a synthetic view of the parabolic doctrine that has hitherto prevented the adoption of a series of more helpful, because more consistent, names.

THE PARABLES, DESIGNATED IN TERMS OF THEIR
SYMBOLISM FOR THE HUMAN SOUL, INDI-
VIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY.

The Great Distinction.

Soils, good and bad, Mt 13.	Lost Coin, Lk 15.
Seeds (Wheat and Tares), Mt 13.	Lost Sheep, Lk 15.
Fish, good and bad, Mt 13.	Lost Son, Lk 15.

Growth and Prayer.

Growing Corn, Mk 4.	Midnight Borrower, Lk 11.
Mustard Seed, Mt 13.	Importunate Widow, Lk 18.
Leaven, Mt 13.	Pharisee and Publican, Lk 18.

Grace and its Conditions.

Treasure Finder, Mt 13.	Dives and Lazarus, Lk 16.
Pearl Merchant, Mt 13.	Good Samaritan, Lk 10.
Unforgiving Debtor, Mt 18.	Two Debtors, Lk 7.

The Divine Claims.

Labourers, Mt 20.	King's Pedlars (Pounds), Lk 19.
Two Sons, Mt 21.	Farm Servant, Lk 17.
Tenants (Husbandmen), Mt 21.	Barren Fig-tree, Lk 13.

Judgment and Doom.

Rebels, Royal Guests and Intruder, Mt 22.	Recusant and Ready Guests, Lk 14.
Bridesmaids, Mt 25.	Sagacious Steward, Lk 16.
Trading Servants (Talents), Mt 25.	Rich Fool, Lk 12.

Literature.

SOCIAL LIFE AT ROME.

SOCIAL LIFE AT ROME IN THE AGE OF
CICERO. By W. Warde Fowler, M.A.
(Macmillan. 10s. net.)

THE leading authority on the religion of Rome, in this country at least, is Mr. W. Warde Fowler, Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College, Oxford. Mr. Fowler does not confine his attention to Roman Religion. His principal books are on the Roman festivals of the Republic and on the City-State of the Greeks and Romans. But he recognizes, as all reliable writers now recognize, that secular and sacred is a distinction without existence among ancient peoples, probably even without comprehension, and that every act of life was a religious act. It is, therefore, not in spite of his wider interests that he is spoken of as the leading authority on religion. It is because his interests are wider than those we now associate with religion. It is because he sees that however little depth religion might have to a Roman, it had an unlimited breadth, war being as religious an act as worship.

In his new book Mr. Warde Fowler has a separate chapter on Religion. But that does not mean that the rest of the book is not on religion. Let the subject be marriage or aqueducts, ever there appears on the page the name of Jupiter or of Juno, or else there is some reference to tabu or divination. The chapter on Religion is the last

chapter in the book, and it is not so much a separate chapter as a summary of the whole.

When St. Paul was in Athens he told the Athenians (according to the Authorized Version), 'Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious.' By some he has been much taken to task for his rudeness of speech; while by others much ingenuity has been exercised to rub the rudeness smooth. The Revisers translate his words, 'somewhat superstitious,' and allow us (in the margin) to say 'religious' if we like. But notice two facts, both brought clearly out by Mr. Warde Fowler.

The first is the clear-sightedness of the phrase 'in all things.' On that phrase Mr. Warde Fowler's book is a commentary. The other thing is the word 'superstitious' itself. St. Paul was speaking to Greeks. If he had been speaking to Romans (and very likely there were Romans in his audience), he would certainly have said 'religious.' But what would he have meant? He would have meant superstitious. For, says Mr. Fowler, to the Roman '*religio*' meant primarily awe, nervousness, scruple—much the same, in fact, as that feeling which in these days we call superstition.' And not only was it what we call superstition, but it was what they—the philosophers whom St. Paul addressed—themselves called superstition. So that when we condemn St. Paul's bad manners, we merely make it known that we have not read Mr. Warde

Fowler yet, and know nothing about Greek or Roman religion.

THE CHILDHOOD OF MAN.

THE CHILDHOOD OF MAN. By Leo Frobenius. (Seeley. 16s. net.)

For a popular introduction to the most popular study of the day, the study of primitive religion, try *The Childhood of Man*, by Dr. Leo Frobenius, which has just been translated into English by Dr. A. H. Keane. That it is intended, in the English translation at any rate, for the use of the absolutely uninitiated is fairly manifest on the face of it, and is frankly stated by the translator in his preface. All the same, it *is* an introduction. Frobenius took incredible pains to get first-hand facts, and then to fit them into their place in some sort of evolutionary system. For he had no doubt whatever that the most grotesque, uncouth, and infantile custom of a Papuan or an Arab had some spiritual significance in itself and some place in that progress in the heart of man out of the darkness which is described by the Apostle Paul as 'seeking the Lord, if haply they may feel after him, and find him.' We have still to ask, perhaps, why they were left seeking so long. But we are now discovering that their darkness was not so Cimmerian as we used to think it was. And that is at least a beginning in the answer to the problem.

The method which Frobenius took to gather his facts was this. He got into correspondence with officials, seafarers, traders, explorers, missionaries, and others engaged in various pursuits among rude and barbarous peoples all over the world. And he transformed his house into a museum for the reception and classification of the gifts they sent him. Thus he got his information, which he then determined to give to the world. But he knew that the world would never read a museum catalogue. And he wrote this popular book, carefully setting things down in order, that their relationship might be seen, suggesting theories and furnishing facts to support them, and succeeding in making the whole work a contribution to science.

The illustrations are numerous. Not one of them has been inserted simply because it is picturesque. One and all they serve the purpose of illustrating the text and enforcing the argument. Among the rest, there are seven full-page plates which present reproductions of water-colour draw-

ings made by John White, Governor of Virginia in the days of Sir Walter Raleigh. These and the number of the black-and-white drawings make the book somewhat costly. But such an introduction to such a subject is worth the money.

The chapters on Secret Societies and Masks, on the Discovery and Use of Fire, on Picture Writing, and on Ancestor-Worship are excellent short descriptions of facts that are fairly familiar; while the chapters on Drums and Bells, on Dress Language, and on Skull Worship contain facts that are unfamiliar and wonderful; and a great ethical revelation to some will be the chapter on the Tests of Manhood.

Among the Books of the Month.

There is so much attention given now to the education of the eye in children, and so little to the training of the imagination, that it would be better if the preacher who preaches to children should endeavour to draw them away from the external world and teach them to look for realities beyond the reach of the senses. But the Rev. John S. Hastie, B.D., in his volume of Open-air Studies with Young Folk entitled *Under the Blue Dome* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.), occupies himself entirely with things that the eye can see. He draws useful moral lessons out of the descriptions of the grass, the lighthouse, and the clouds, but does not often touch that higher faculty which must be touched in youth if the man or woman is ever with full confidence to say, 'Whom not having seen we love, in whom, though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.'

We have been so much taken up with the criticism of the Bible that its exposition has been suffering. In America, commentaries have been coming out quite steadily, most of them, it must be confessed, regardless of the results of our criticism, but occasionally incorporating them, and so getting in front of us. Here is one. Its general title is 'The Interpreter's Commentary on the New Testament.' The volume on *The Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians* (Barnes; \$1.50) has been written by Professor McFadyen of Knox University, Toronto. Is it possible to test it by one comment? Take the comment on 'Abba, Father' in Gal 4:

'It is the *spirit* that cries through them; in Rom. viii. 15, "*we cry*." The word *cry* recalls the ecstatic spiritual experiences alluded to in 1 Cor. xiv. *Abba* was Jesus' own word (Mark xiv. 36); it had been familiar to Aramaic Christians, and had passed from them to Greek-speaking Christians. The sons who used this word would feel themselves peculiarly one with the Son who had taught them to use it. It would be natural for them to add to it their own native Greek word, just as we might say, "*Abba, Father*." This blending of Greek and Aramaic, in a context which has been arguing for the abolition of the distinction between Jew and Greek (iii. 28), is suggestive, though of course this is not the *reason* for the juxtaposition of the words.'

Big prices are now given for the octavo editions of Ranke's Histories in their English translation. But it is a mere fashion, and a foolish one. For the editions which are published by Messrs. George Bell & Sons are not only as good, though cheaper; they are in every way a great deal better. The translations are more accurate, the volumes handier, the notes and indexes fuller and more accessible.

There has just been issued in this series a new edition of Ranke's *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations* (6s. net). The book was first issued in English in Bohn's 'Standard Library' twenty-two years ago. The translator was Mr. P. A. Ashworth. Mr. Ashworth's name now disappears from the title-page; for so thoroughly has his translation been revised by Mr. G. R. Dennis that it has been revised almost out of existence. The new edition further contains a new feature in the form of an introduction contributed by Mr. Edward Armstrong, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. of Fleet Street have issued four new volumes this month, and re-issued a fifth. The re-issue is *Our City of God*, by Mr. J. Brierley (3s. 6d.).

One of the new volumes is the result of an article which appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*, and of which some notice was taken in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—an article entitled 'Jesus or Christ?' written by the Rev. R. Roberts. The article was certainly not worth a place in any magazine. But

it said openly and without any literary grace, the same thing as a good many other writers are saying, that Jesus Christ was merely a man, with a man's weakness and sin, and that, in short, if we are not to fall intellectually into the rear we must all make haste and become Unitarians. The only significance which the article had was in the description of its author as a Congregational minister. But in the following number of the *Hibbert Journal*, Dr. Horton points out that the title is misleading, as Mr. Roberts 'has not been a minister in the Congregational sense for eleven years back.' So the value of Dr. Warschauer's book is not in its occasion but in itself, and especially in the excellent answer it makes to those who, unblest with reverence, find our Lord Jesus Christ no better than He should be. The title of the book is *Jesus or Christ?* (1s. 6d. net).

The Judges of Jesus—what a title! And yet it is quite appropriate. Who were they?—Judas, Annas, Peter, Caiaphas, Herod, Pilate's wife, Pilate. And now they themselves have been judged, and Jesus is their judge. It makes a striking course of sermons in the hands of the Rev. J. G. Stevenson, the temporal and the eternal rubbing shoulders together, for once visibly, but just to the same issues as they do with ourselves every day (2s. net).

The Art of Sermon Illustration, by the Editor of the *Christian World Pulpit*, will be considered on another page (3s. 6d. net).

The book that has attracted us most has the title of *The First Things of Jesus* (3s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. John Reid, M.A., one of the few men in our day (even when we take all the Churches together they are few) who have the gift of exposition. The volume contains studies of certain sayings of our Lord in which He used the word 'first.' Now in the mouth of Christ 'first' is a significant word. It looks like a word of time; it is really a word of eternity. Even the Son of Man must first suffer—suffer before something else certainly; but also as the chief thing; and to-day we write about the significance of Christ's death as the event on earth with most manifestly eternal issues. Of the last of the chapters the title is 'The First Stone.' In that chapter Mr. Reid handles the difficult subject of the woman taken in adultery, and in handling it keeps us in a clean bracing atmosphere. We wish to recommend this book. Its simplicity

is a triumph, for it is the fruit of much reading and experience.

Mr. Culley has been good enough to send us a copy of *A Lineal Index to the Methodist Hymn-Book* (6s. 6d. net), although we do not belong to the 'People called Methodists.' But Mr. Culley is a wide-awake publisher. He knows that we have readers among the 'People called Methodists,' and many of them. More than that, he is full of pride in his own publications. He believes that the Methodist Hymn-Book, even if it is not used publicly at worship, is likely enough to be used privately in the study, by Christians of every Church and denomination. Now a hymn-book that is to be used in the study, that is, for illustration, needs an index. For how often have we a word or a thought, or even a shred of a verse, which would have been an illustration and a telling one, if we could have fixed it down by means of an index. We can fix it down now. We can fix down hundreds of thousands of words and thoughts. And we owe that inestimable boon to the Rev. William Miles.

Mr. Frowde is not too late yet with his Oxford edition of *The Complete Poetical Works of Edgar Allan Poe* (2s.), though we shall soon be off with the old love and on with a new, so many are the centenaries that fall due this year. It is an edition which does credit even to Oxford editorship. There is a memoir, a bibliography, all the poems in good large type, an index to their first lines, and three essays on poetry.

What is a classic? It is not a book about the classics. But if a book about the classics takes such a hold of the readers of literature that it passes through edition after edition till the author has nothing more to do with it than let it circulate and the publishers simply produce another impression; and if it is itself literature, being written both with knowledge and distinction—is not that book a classic? The book is *A History of Greek Literature*, by Frank Byron Jevons, M.A., Litt.D., Principal of Hatfield Hall in the University of Durham (Griffin; 8s. 6d.).

In *Health and Happiness* which comes from the Griffith & Rowland Press in Philadelphia, Mr. R. M. Harbin, M.D., has made a persevering

effort to use his medical knowledge for the advancement of the Kingdom. His subject is the relation between disease and sin, a subject that stands greatly in need of capable and unhysterical handling. Perhaps Dr. Harbin is just a trifle too anxious to be edifying, but certainly he has no bias in favour of the indifference of sin, and that is great gain. He believes in the possibility of recovery from sin as from a disease, by slow stages of self-denial chiefly. He believes further that certain spiritual faculties may be wholly lost through sin, as certain physical faculties may be wholly lost through disease. But then he believes that the faculties which remain may be cultivated to an exceptional degree of perfection. In the Forty-third Report of the Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, Dr. Howe states that Julia Brace, a blind and deaf mute, could instantly recognize persons she had met before as soon as she caught the odour from their glove or hand. She was employed to sort out the clothing of each of the pupils after it came from the wash.

Dr. Campbell Morgan has begun his Analysis of the Bible, after three preliminary volumes, with *The Gospel according to John* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). And first there is a scheme of contents, the whole of the contents of the Gospel being set forth in five parallel columns. It is a courageous effort, and it has cost the author thought. The inevitable criticism is that John himself was not half so ingenious as Dr. Campbell Morgan. But even if the criticism is just, it does not make the book less valuable if we keep our eyes open. Dr. Campbell Morgan finds Love, Life, Light expounded in great recurring spaces throughout the Gospel, and all in order, like a treatise in Systematic Theology. It is well worth our while to consider whether that is so.

The Jewish Publication Society of America is working upon a new translation of the Old Testament into English, part of which has already been published. It has also undertaken a series of commentaries to be written by Jewish scholars. The enterprise is admirable. One only wonders that Jewish scholarship has not done more for the interpretation of the Old Testament.

The first volume of the Commentary has been written by Mr. Max L. Margolis, Ph.D. The book is *Micah*. Mr. Margolis is quite well

acquainted with the criticism of the last forty years (to go back no further than Ewald), but his attitude is fairly conservative. He is reluctant to separate any of the prophecies from Micah's authorship. Even Mic 2^{12, 18} he retains by accepting Ibn Ezra's suggestion of placing the verses within quotation marks as a sample of the optimistic sermons of the false prophets. In the commentary he uses more liberty. The translation followed is the new Jewish one, though not uniformly. Mic 6⁸ reads—

It hath been declared unto thee, O man, what is good :
And what doth the Lord require of thee,
But to execute justice, and to love kindness,
And to walk humbly with thy God ?

There is a good note on the word 'remnant,' with a reference to the liturgy of the Synagogue, in which the Jews designate themselves as the remnant, and pray to God not to suffer them to perish.

The National Council of Free Churches did a courageous thing in determining to include a volume on *Conversion* in their 'Christian Faith and Doctrine' series (Law; 2s. 6d. net). For conversion is not now regarded as a scientific fact, or its title as a scientific term. They did a yet more courageous thing in entrusting the volume to Dr. Newton H. Marshall. For Dr. Marshall is the latest product of all the sciences, physical, sociological, psychical.

What is the result? The result is a volume in which conversion is confirmed as a fact, a fact of New Testament times and a fact in the life of to-day. Dr. Marshall takes all the sciences with him. Of the science of psychology he makes even liberal use, openly acknowledging his obligations to Professor Starbuck and Professor James. But conversion is a fact. And it is an experience which every man must pass through in order to reach the glory of his manhood. Dr. Marshall is not troubled with niceties of theological distinction. He knows what men have written about the difference between conversion and regeneration, and he does not deny the difference. But he says that conversion and regeneration make but one reality, a reality which is indivisible except by logical abstraction. And the full title of his book is *Conversion or the New Birth*.

We must always be careful not to criticise a book by its relation to our own opinion. Professor

Francis J. Hall, D.D., of the Western Theological Seminary in Chicago, has written a book on *The Being and Attributes of God* (Longmans; 6s. net). Its doctrine of God is not in every respect our doctrine. What of that? We shall learn the more from it. It is the book of a student, the book of a thinker, the book of a believer. There is not a loose sentence in it, and there is no trivial rhetoric. It is, above all, the book of a student. Professor Hall's knowledge of the subject is an amazement. While other men are circling about Calvin or Arminius, Simeon or Newman, like children in a merry-go-round, and never getting away, this man has studied every article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, and opened his mind to the revelation that is there sent to him, believing that he is bound in his doctrine of God to account for all that God tells him of Himself through the Ainus and the Apaches, as well as through the children of Israel. And this larger study has not only enlarged his circle of belief; it has altered the position of its centre. Its centre now is not Calvinism or Newmanism. It is not even the Christ of these men. It is that larger, fuller Christ, who was, and is, and is to be.

Canon Robinson of Ripon has written an able and candid book on the Resurrection of our Lord—*Studies in the Resurrection of Christ* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). He knows the difficulties. He has written 'from the standpoint of one to whom the difficulties involved in the belief in the Resurrection of Christ are very real, and to whom they would appear insuperable if the evidence which is available in its support were put forward in order to prove the resurrection of any ordinary man.' That sentence exposes the heart of the volume. As for the resurrection body, Canon Robinson holds that while the Resurrection was an objective reality, the body in which Christ rose was not a material, but a spiritual body.

"In the name of the holy Trinity, Father, and Sonn, and Holy Ghost, I Raynold Peacock, bishopp of Chycester unworthy, of mine own pure and free will, without any man's cohertion or dread, confess and acknowledge, that I here before time presuming of mine own natural witt, and preferring the judgment of naturall reason before the New and Old Testaments, and the authority and determination of our moder holy church, have holden, felyd,

written, and taught otherwise, then the holy Romane and universal church teacheth, preacheth, and observeth. . . . And on this to declaration of my commission, and repentance, I here openly assent, that my said books, works, and writings, for consideration and cause above rehearsed, be deputed unto the fire, and openly be burnt, into the example and terror of all other." In the words of this recantation the career of the only great English theologian of the fifteenth century ended.'

And so begins the account of the life of Reginald Pecock, which Professor J. L. Morison contributes to his edition of *Reginald Pecock's Book of Faith* (Maclehose; 5s. net). The introduction is also an essay on 'The Development of Fifteenth Century Opinion,' and valuable enough to be referred to henceforth by students of that period of English History. The Book of Faith itself is also chiefly of historical interest, not of quite so much account theologically now. It has been edited with much loving care from the manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Under the editorship of the Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D., F.R.S.E., Messrs. Methuen have undertaken the publication of a series of handbooks of English Church History (2s. 6d. net each). Two volumes are issued; (1) *The Foundations of the English Church*, by J. H. Maude, M.A.; (2) *The Saxon Church and the Norman Conquest*, by C. T. Cruttwell, M.A. The series challenges no comparison with Macmillan's handsome set. The volumes are smaller, cheaper, more popular. But it looks as if each volume were to be put into hands that are just as scholarly. These two volumes leave nothing to be desired in that way. And we notice that a subsequent volume is to be written by Dr. Alfred Plummer. We congratulate Mr. Burn upon the idea and the successful realization of it.

Mr. Murray has published *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1908 (2s. 6d. net). This is the third year of issue. The volume contains eighteen papers ranging from 'Classical Work in Schools,' by the editor (Dr. W. H. D. Rouse), to 'The New Testament,' by Professor Peake. The 'Greek Mythology and Religion' is done by Dr. Farnell, and the 'Roman Religion and Mythology' by Mr. Warde Fowler. Dr. Hunt contributes the article on the Papyri, and Dr. Moulton the article on Hellenistic Greek.

Horatius Bonar was born in Edinburgh on the 19th day of December 1808. On the 21st day of January 1909, a great public meeting was held in the Grange Church of his native city. Lord Ardwall was in the chair. Speeches were delivered by the Bishop of Durham, Lord Polwarth, Lord Guthrie, Dr. Alexander Whyte, and others. And then, on the Sunday following, sermons were preached in the same church by Dr. Robertson Nicoll and Dr. George Wilson. And now all these speeches and sermons have been brought together in a volume, entitled *Memories of Dr. Horatius Bonar*, which has been published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier (2s. 6d. net). For, at the end of a century, we have begun to realize how great a man Horatius Bonar was.

For the knowledge of Christ is it better to trust to the historical Gospels or to our own imagination? It is better, says Franz Hartmann, M.D., to trust to our own imagination. For 'We can have no self-knowledge about persons that existed before we were born; but we may at any time and in every place realize the presence of the true Saviour, the eternal living Christ within ourselves.' Moreover, 'While there seems to be a vein of truth in regard to actual historical occurrences underlying the Gospel accounts, the great bulk of the latter is in contradiction to common sense, and merely a repetition of different allegories, such as we may find in the ancient books of the Egyptians, Persians, and Brahmins.' Accordingly Mr. Hartmann has written *The Life of Jehoshua, the Prophet of Nazareth* (Kegan Paul; 7s. 6d.); and Mr. Hartmann's Jehoshua is not the Jesus of the Evangelists.

From the Pilgrim Press come *Silas Marner and Scenes of Clerical Life* in one handsome volume, with illustrations by Watson Charlton (2s. 6d. net).

The History of Civilization is of more importance than the History of Politics. Professor Seignobos of the University of Paris is its historian. He has written its history in three volumes—Ancient, Mediæval, Modern. Mr. Fisher Unwin has had them all translated; the last, under the title of *History of Contemporary Civilization* (5s. net), being just out. The facts which the volume contains may all be had for the gathering. But to gather them all one might have to read half the

volumes which are named in the bibliographies at the end. And then they would have to be arranged and set forth with the simplicity and grace of French writing before their significance could make its impression. All the trouble is saved by the reading of this convenient volume.

Mr. Fisher Unwin has issued a new impression of *Coillard of the Zambesi* (6s.), which is the history of the lives of François and Christina Coillard of the Paris Missionary Society, in South and Central Africa, 1858-1904, written by C. W. Mackintosh. It is itself a continued illustration of the text 'In perils oft,' and of the text 'Cast down, but not dismayed.' But it contains also some particular illustrations of texts, two of which are worth referring to.

King Mosilikatse, like King Saul, could not endure to hear greater praise-words than his own. When the preacher dwelt upon the royal glories of our Saviour, he would give the signals to his chiefs to rise and drown the praises of Christ in his own. The National Assemblies always opened with a hymn of praise to the king, chanted by all present, like a cathedral chorus, and followed by a presentation of cattle as offerings to him.

Again, this is the idea of the future life among the Zambesians: 'The dead go to Nyambé, taking the name of *ifu*, i.e. the manes or ancestral spirits. They are judged *beforehand* by Nyambé. The moment any one [*i.e.* any arrival in the spirit-world] is announced to him, Nyambé gives his orders. If the person is worthy, the servants of Nyambé point out to him a little path, very narrow, which leads to himself. Here the new arrival will possess vast herds and whole tribes of slaves—their ideal of happiness. If, on the contrary, it is one unworthy of Nyambé's favours, a broad and much-beaten road is pointed out to him, which gradually effaces itself more and more, and ends in a frightful desert, where the poor wretch wanders till he dies of hunger and thirst.'

Mr. Hugh MacColl has written a book on *Man's Origin, Destiny, and Duty* (Williams & Norgate; 4s. 6d. net). He is most interested in man's duty, and not in what it is, so much as in why he should do it. Why should a man do his duty? First, says Mr. MacColl, because just as there are animals below man who have not the faculties to enable them to know of his existence, so there are beings

above man of whose lives *he* knows nothing for the same reason. Second, these higher beings have their virtues and vices, but they are gradually eliminating the vices and strengthening the virtues. Third, just as man acquires mastery over the animals below him, so these beings acquire mastery over him. Fourth, as man will be held responsible for his treatment of the lower animals, so these beings will be held responsible for their treatment of him. Fifth, and last, the whole universe is controlled either by *One* Supreme Being, or else by two or more Supreme Beings whose thoughts and actions are always so close in unison that they may virtually be regarded as *One*. 'On these reasonable assumptions,' says Mr. MacColl, 'a workable system of ethics may be erected.' Mr. MacColl has also republished two articles which he contributed to the *Hibbert Journal*. They are characteristic.

Mr. J. Allanson Picton, M.A., has written a history of the Bible in the Church. He calls it *Man and the Bible* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net). Now Mr. Allanson Picton is no bibliolater. We shall prove it by a single quotation. It is a footnote to p. 199. 'I must reiterate that the Fourth Gospel does not count, being a very late first-century or early second-century romance.' He is no bibliolater; and yet his history of the treatment which the Bible received throughout the ages of Christianity, and most of all where Christianity has been most an official and ecclesiastical Christianity, is one long exclamation of amazement and regret.

He writes the history of the Bible backwards. Beginning with the present day, he works his way back through the centuries, till he comes to St. Paul and the primitive Christians. Then he gives three separate chapters which cut across the whole space of the Christian centuries, one on the Bible and Religion, one on the Bible and Morals, and one on the Bible and Social Evolution.

In the chapter on the Bible and Morals he offers a fine free testimony to the supremacy of conscience. Here, as a thinker, he seems to be most at home. Here at any rate his heart is most entirely with him. He places the Early Christian martyrs as far above the Roman heroes like Scaevola and Regulus as true self-sacrifice is above pride. Even Socrates is surpassed in nobility, although in his cheerful indifference to everything but truth he stands alone

in his death through all the pagan world. The Christian martyr is nobler in that his death was voluntary. He could easily have escaped it if conscience had allowed.

Mr. Allanson Picton is no bibliolater, we have said. He thinks, indeed, that the influence of bibliolatriy has been overstated in our day. The great demand now as always is not for less use of the Bible or less reverence, but more and fuller.

Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale is one of our foremost New Testament scholars. His mind is at once reverent and unfettered, a profitable combination. And he spares no pains. At the Yale University Press he has published *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*, which is 'A Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Sources and Structure of the Gospel according to Mark, with Expository Notes upon the Text, for English Readers.' The criticism, which occupies an introduction of forty pages,

must be mastered first. For the expository notes rest upon it at every step. 'After seventy years of fervent debate,' two things are settled: (1) that Mark is the literary groundwork of Matthew and Luke; (2) that Matthew and Luke have independently used Mark and another evangelical writing, principally made up of the teaching of Jesus, this writing being called Q. To these Dr. Bacon adds that Mark is not simply the preaching of Peter, but is certainly influenced by the Pauline Epistles, and has also made use of Q.

Dr. Bacon is acquainted with the very latest work done on the New Testament. Thus we observe that he is aware of the warning to keep the use of the papyri within bounds—a warning already uttered by so distinguished a papyrist as Dr. Moulton. If the language of the New Testament is the language of the common people, it is something more. And that something is the mind of Christ.

The Virgin Birth.

BY THE REV. J. S. COOPER, M.A., LIVERPOOL.

Do we view the doctrine of the Virgin Birth from the standpoint of the author of St. Luke's Gospel? The doctrine is regarded to-day, in many quarters, as a proof of the Divinity of our Lord. Surely in Apostolic times it was regarded as a proof of the humanity of our Lord. The particular question was as to whether Christ had come in the flesh. The Christian experience of Him and of the Holy Spirit was vivid enough—so vivid that it seemed hardly credible that the origin of all these Divine impulses was once in a carpenter's shop at Nazareth. And so it was necessary to prove the human motherhood of Jesus. The First Epistle of John emphasizes all this. The Epistle begins by declaring that Christ is no phantom. He is 'that which we have seen, which we have looked right into, which our hands have handled.' In 1 Jn 4²⁻³ and 5²⁰⁻²¹ all this is emphasized. And the Epistle ends with a warning against 'idols'—that is, mere appearances lacking substantial reality.

The world has always had a gospel—even a gospel about heaven. Christianity gave this gospel a foundation on the earth. It did not content it-

self with speculating about immortality; it revealed an immortal being, one whose immortality was shown openly and incontestably by resurrection from the dead, one who could not be holden of death.

Thus the labour expended on discovering the mother of our Lord and perpetuating her reality had as its object the certifying of hopes that had previously had no secure foundation in the only realm where human knowledge can substantiate itself.

Again, it is a remarkable fact that the Acts of the Apostles contains nothing directly concerning the Virgin birth, though the book is acknowledged as due to the author of the Third Gospel and written to the same destination. But in the view that the author of St. Luke's Gospel was to emphasize the human reality of our Lord by the stories of the birth, we find the point of view prominent enough in the Acts. In 2²² He is 'a man approved of God'; in 3^{13, 26} 4²⁷ He is 'the Servant' of God; in 3²² He is 'a prophet from among your brethren, like unto Moses' (see J. Weiss's article

The doctrine of the Resurrection is an example of this. We do not recognize as we should that the Pharisees and the Apostles taught the same doctrine—the doctrine of the Resurrection (note Ac 23⁶⁻⁸). It is one more instance of the truth that Christ came not to create hopes, but to fulfil hopes. The hope of immortality was there. How it was to be realized was a mere speculation. It was Christ who brought immortality to light. It was He who abolished death. It was His work which for the first time gave substance to the hope. And so we find (Ac 4²) they proclaimed ‘in Jesus’ the resurrection from the dead. The difference between the Pharisee and the Christian Apostle was a difference as to how the resurrection was to come about; or rather, perhaps, we should say the Pharisee contented himself with a speculative philosophy on the subject; the Apostles explained a ground for the hope. It was

This is all accounted for by the mental attitude of the people of New Testament times. They were matter-of-fact rather than speculative. Theory possessed a purely academic interest. The crowds, for example, that followed our Lord were unsophisticated. A logical proof, however convincing, would not have satisfied them. They knew better than to trust the skill of argument in matters that really concerned their welfare. And humanity is again and again returning to this point. When the world grows tired of its philosophies and religions it turns to simplicity. And Christianity won, not because it could prove the necessity for belief in the immortality of the soul, but because it was able to point to one who, flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, had died and risen from the dead and who lived in the heavens dispensing the marvellous graces to His followers.

MATTHEW.		MATTHEW (continued).		MATTHEW (continued).		MARK (continued).	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1 ¹⁹	136 ^b	11 ¹⁴	460 ^b	20 ²⁶	372 ^b	3	634 ^b
3 ⁷	478 ^b	11 ¹⁹	92 ^a	23 ¹	479 ^a	3 ⁵	478 ^a
3 ¹⁶	2 ^a	12 ²⁸	578 ^b	24 ^{10, 12}	623 ^b	3 ²²	515 ^b
4 ⁸	316 ^a , 330 ^a	12 ⁴⁰	54 ^a , 846 ^a	24 ¹⁵	579 ^a	3 ²⁹	481 ^b
5 ³	372 ^b	12 ⁴⁵	65 ^b	25 ¹⁴⁻³⁰	479 ^a	4 ³	634 ^b
5 ¹⁸	275 ^a	14 ¹⁹ 15 ³⁶	167 ^b	25 ²¹	100 ^b	5 ⁶	118 ^a
5 ²²	53 ^a	14 ³³	118 ^a	26 ⁶	92 ^a	5 ²²	118 ^b
5 ²⁶	592 ^a	15 ⁹	93 ^a	26 ²⁶	167 ^b , 591 ^b	6 ²	621 ^b
5 ²⁷⁻³⁰	131 ^a , 132 ^a , 137 ^a	15 ²⁵	118 ^a	26 ³⁸	616 ^b	6 ⁷	635 ^a
5 ^{29, 39}	330 ^a	16 ¹³⁻²⁰	635 ^a	27 ⁴⁶	3 ^a , 481 ^b	6 ¹³	557 ^a
5 ³²	132 ^a	17 ¹⁰	458 ^b	28 ⁹	118 ^b	8 ³¹	635 ^b
5 ³⁴	411 ^b	17 ¹⁴	118 ^a	28 ¹⁶	636 ^a	8 ³³	479 ^a
6 ⁵	118 ^b , 119 ^a	18 ¹⁵⁻²⁰	635 ^a	28 ¹⁹	586 ^a	8 ³⁵	621 ^b
8 ²	118 ^a	18 ^{18, 19}	49 ^b			11 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	479 ^a
8 ¹²	317 ^b	19 ²	855 ^b		MARK.	12 ¹⁴	852 ^a
9 ¹⁸	118 ^a , 610 ^b	19 ⁶	589 ^a	1 ^{1, 14, 15}	634 ^b	12 ³¹	357 ^a
10 ²	635 ^b	19 ⁹	132 ^a	1 ¹¹	589 ^{a, b}	13 ¹⁴	579 ^a

MARK (continued).

13 ¹⁴⁻²⁰	PAGE
13 ³²	204 ^a
14 ³	588 ^b
14 ²²⁻²⁵	854 ^a
14 ³⁶	635 ^b
14 ³⁶	119 ^a
15 ³⁴	8 ^a
16 ⁷	3 ^b
	636 ^a

LUKE.

1 ¹⁷	460 ^b
1 ³⁷	655 ^a
2 ⁵¹	857 ^a
3 ³⁸	86 ^b
4 ¹⁶⁻²¹	634 ^b
5 ⁸	118 ^a
6 ¹³	635 ^{a, b}
7 ^{32, 36}	92 ^a
8 ³¹	54 ^a
8 ⁴¹	118 ^b
10 ⁴	330 ^a
10 ³⁰	598 ^b
10 ³¹	64 ^b
10 ³⁴	557 ^a
11 ²⁰	578 ^b
11 ^{24, 26}	65 ^b
12 ^{47, 48}	592 ^a
13 ²⁰	855 ^b
16 ⁸	190 ^b
16 ¹⁷	275 ^a
16 ^{22, 23}	445 ^a
18 ^{9, 14}	8 ^a
18 ¹¹	118 ^b , 119 ^a
22 ^{14, 29, 30}	635 ^{a, b}
22 ⁴¹	110 ^a
23 ⁴⁶	607 ^a
24 ⁴	117 ^a
24 ¹⁰	635 ^b
24 ³³	636 ^a
24 ³⁵	167 ^b

JOHN.

1 ¹	311 ^a , 312 ^b , 314 ^a
1 ^{12, 18}	316 ^b , 318 ^b
1 ¹⁴	115 ^b
2 ¹	588 ^a , 607 ^a
2 ¹⁹	92 ^a
3 ⁶	588 ^a
3 ¹⁶	630 ^a
3 ²⁸	61 ^a
4 ^{21, 24}	479 ^a
4 ²⁴	793 ^b
6 ¹²	61 ^b
6 ⁵⁶	168 ^a
7 ⁴⁹	591 ^b
8 ¹⁻¹¹	386 ^a
8 ⁴⁰	130 ^b , 136 ^b
9 ⁸⁸	607 ^a
10 ³⁰	118 ^a
11 ³²	104 ^b
12 ²	118 ^a
12 ¹⁴	92 ^a
12 ³¹	502 ^a
13 ³⁴	578 ^b
14 ⁶	174 ^a
14 ³	63 ^a
14 ^{16, 26}	479 ^a
14 ²⁸	139 ^b , 140 ^a
	316 ^b

JOHN (continued).

14 ³⁰	PAGE
15 ²⁶	578 ^b
	139 ^b , 140 ^a , 317 ^a
16 ⁷	559 ^a , 586 ^a
16 ¹¹	139 ^b , 140 ^a
17 ²⁰	578 ^b
20 ¹⁹⁻²³	636 ^a
20 ²³	635 ^a , 636 ^a
21 ¹⁵⁻¹⁷	49 ^b
	635 ^b

ACTS.

1	636 ^a
1 ⁶	620 ^a
2 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	612 ^a
2 ^{22, 23}	620 ^{a, b}
2 ²⁸	630 ^a
2 ⁴²	641 ^b
2 ⁴²⁻⁴⁶	167 ^{a, b}
2 ⁴⁴	411 ^b , 626 ^b
3 ^{13, 18}	629 ^{a, b}
3 ¹⁹	629 ^b , 630 ^b
4 ⁵	627 ^a
4 ³²	626 ^b
5	631 ^b
5 ¹	50 ^a
6	631 ^b , 634 ^b , 636 ^a
7 ^{55, 59}	118 ^b
8 ¹⁸	50 ^a
8 ³⁷	38 ^b
9 ⁴⁻⁶	118 ^b
10 ¹⁰	167 ^a
10 ²⁶	118 ^a
10 ^{34, 35}	61 ^b
10 ³⁸	557 ^a
10 ⁴¹	636 ^a
11 ²⁹	24 ^b
13 ¹ 14 ²³	636 ^b
15	628 ^a
15 ²²	636 ^b
17 ⁶	213 ^b
17 ²³	215 ^a , 217 ^a , 338 ^b
19 ⁶	636 ^b
20 ^{7, 11}	167 ^a
20 ³⁶ 21 ⁵	119 ^a
21 ²¹	623 ^a
22 ¹⁷⁻²¹	118 ^b
24 ²⁵	318 ^a
25 ²³	40 ^a
27 ³⁵	167 ^a

ROMANS.

1 ¹⁸	479 ^a
2 ^{5, 8}	481 ^b
2 ⁶	587 ^a
2 ²²	132 ^a
3 ^{8, 31}	582 ^a
3 ²⁵	139 ^b
3 ^{25, 26}	479 ^a , 559 ^a
4 ^{15, 23}	479 ^a
5 ²	62 ^b
5 ³	61 ^a
5 ¹²	479 ^a , 481 ^b
5 ¹²⁻²¹	560 ^a , 587 ^b
6 ¹	86 ^b
6 ⁷⁻¹⁰	582 ^a
7 ¹⁵	591 ^a
7 ^{18, 24}	479 ^a
	587 ^b
	645 ^a

ROMANS (continued).

8 ²	PAGE
8 ¹³	403 ^a
8 ¹⁵	630 ^b
8 ²³	8 ^a , 115 ^b
8 ²⁹	115 ^b
8 ³⁴	104 ^b , 405 ^b
9 ⁴	139 ^b
9 ²²	115 ^{a, b}
10 ⁷	479 ^a , 587 ^b
12 ⁶	54 ^a
12 ¹⁶	415 ^b
12 ¹⁷	372 ^b
13 ¹	631 ^a
13 ¹⁻⁷	420 ^a
13 ⁹	631 ^a
14	132 ^a
14 ^{2, 6, 14}	630 ^b
14 ¹¹	92 ^a
14 ¹³	119 ^a
16 ⁷	93 ^a
16 ¹⁶	636 ^b
16 ¹⁷⁻²⁰	174 ^a
	49 ^b

I CORINTHIANS

2 ²	7 ^b
2 ^{13, 14}	606 ^b
2 ¹⁵	403 ^a
4 ¹⁴	101 ^a
5	49 ^b , 50 ^a
5 ¹¹	631 ^b
5 ¹	132 ^b
5 ¹⁰ 6 ⁹ 7 ²⁰	630 ^b
6 ¹²	631 ^a
6 ²⁰	92 ^b
7	631 ^b
7 ¹⁸	630 ^b , 631 ^b
7 ^{26, 38}	330 ^a
7 ³⁰	92 ^a
7 ³⁶	92 ^b
8 ^{4, 8}	179 ^b
8 ⁹⁻¹²	92 ^a
9 ⁹	92 ^b , 93 ^a
9 ¹³	329 ^b
9 ²⁴⁻²⁷	338 ^a
9 ²⁷	92 ^a
10	630 ^b
10 ¹⁶	630 ^a
10 ¹⁸	167 ^b
10 ²¹	338 ^a
10 ²³	338 ^{a, b}
10 ²⁷	92 ^b
11 ³⁻¹⁶	92 ^a
11 ¹⁷⁻²⁴	86 ^b , 93 ^a
11 ^{22, 24}	167 ^b
11 ²³	632 ^b
11 ²⁵	79 ^a , 591 ^b
12 ^{5, 6}	175 ^a
12 ¹²⁻¹⁴	636 ^b
13 ⁸	637 ^b
14	317 ^b
14 ⁴⁰	632 ^a
15 ⁴	92 ^b
15 ¹⁰	629 ^b
15 ^{20, 22, 45-49}	637 ^b
15 ²⁸	86 ^b , 607 ^a
	317 ^b

2 CORINTHIANS.

1 ²¹	557 ^a
2 ⁵⁻¹¹	49 ^b , 101 ^a

2 CORINTHIANS (continued).

3 ⁶	PAGE
4 ¹	331 ^a
5 ⁹	637 ^b
5 ¹⁸	371 ^b
5 ²¹	638 ^a
6 ¹⁴	479 ^a
6 ¹⁵	93 ^a
6 ¹⁶	578 ^b
6 ¹⁷ 9 ⁶	589 ^a
	631 ^a

GALATIANS.

1 ⁸	636 ^b
2	628 ^a
2 ⁵	93 ^a
2 ^{9, 12}	636 ^b
2 ¹⁴	101 ^a
3 ¹³	479 ^a
3 ¹⁶	329 ^b
4 ⁵	109 ^b , 115 ^b
4 ⁶	8 ^a
4 ²⁴	329 ^b
5 ¹	93 ^a
5 ⁴	623 ^b
5 ¹³	92 ^b
5 ¹⁷	645 ^a
5 ²¹ 6 ^{2, 14}	631 ^a
6 ¹⁰	598 ^b

EPHESIANS.

1 ⁵	115 ^b
2 ³	479 ^a
2 ¹²	637 ^b
2 ¹⁸ 3 ¹²	63 ^a
2 ²⁰	635 ^a
3 ¹⁴	118 ^b
4 ¹¹	636 ^b , 637 ^b
4 ²⁶	476 ^a
5	631 ^a
5 ⁶	479 ^b , 582 ^a

PHILIPPIANS.

1 ⁹	92 ^b
2 ⁸	786 ^b
2 ⁸	590 ^a
2 ¹⁰	54 ^a , 119 ^a
2 ^{12, 13}	8 ^a
2 ¹⁵ 3 ²⁰	631 ^a
4 ²²	629 ^a

COLOSSIANS.

1 ⁵ 3 ²	631 ^a
1 ²⁴	616 ^b
1 ²⁸	101 ^a
2 ³	630 ^b , 631 ^a
2 ⁹	149 ^a
3 ³	631 ^b
4 ¹⁴	626 ^a

I THESSALONIANS.

1 ¹⁰	479 ^a
2 ²	101 ^a
2 ¹² 4 ¹	631 ^b
4 ⁶	132 ^a
4 ¹¹	371 ^b , 631 ^b
5 ⁹	481 ^b
5 ¹⁴	49 ^b , 101 ^a
5 ^{19, 20}	637 ^b
5 ²³	606 ^b

[illegible]

Contributions and Comments.

Note on Jeremiah xvii. 11.

THE general intention of this verse is obvious. The prophet is insisting on the insecurity of ill-gotten gains. He enforces his point by a metaphorical allusion to some actual or supposed habit of the partridge with regard to young which it has stolen, and which will desert their foster-parent.

But there is beyond this some uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the first half of the verse. The translation of the A.V., 'As the partridge sitteth *on eggs*, and hatcheth them not,' appears pointless, as it furnishes no analogy to the instability of ill-gotten wealth. The A.V. marg. and R.V. translates: 'As the partridge that gathereth *young* which she hath not brought forth.' But the R.V. marg. has, 'sitteth *on eggs* which she hath not laid.' With this a very large number of commentators agree (e.g. *Speaker's Commentary*, Keil, Dr. Driver, Dr. Post, article 'Partridge' in *H.D.B.*). It is, however, pretty obvious that

the word *yāladh*, 'to bring forth,' applies equally well both to laying and hatching, and the word *dāghar*—if it means, as Keil maintains, *fovet*—would be equally applicable to sitting on eggs or keeping young ones warm and rearing them. It is not, however, my intention to discuss further the question of translation, but to point out that modern commentators have gone astray in supposing that the allusion is to a supposed habit of the partridge, not supported by natural history, but grounded on the fact that the partridge lays an abnormal number of eggs. It has been supposed that the partridge, in addition to its own eggs, robs other nests. It is, of course, true, or probably true, that young ones not laid or not hatched (according to the interpretation of the clause) by the partridge do not in reality desert their foster-mother, and that this may very probably be grounded on popular belief; though even this supposition is only founded on a reasonable conjecture. But the habit itself of the partridge is

not a popular belief, but a well-ascertained fact, and Jeremiah is proved to be a better ornithologist than his modern interpreters. This is true, curiously enough, whichever interpretation is adopted, and it appears a special characteristic of the partridge.

As bearing on the interpretation of R.V. margin, I may perhaps be allowed to give my own experience. In the year 1906 I found in a covert what was probably a pheasant's nest with about seven pheasant's eggs in it, and a large number of partridge's eggs all cold. I went again a few days after, hoping to see a bird sitting on the nest, but found the eggs destroyed, probably by a weasel. I made, however, inquiries, and was informed that such occurrences are fairly common, and that the sitting bird is usually, if not always, the partridge. Whether in such cases the partridge turns out the pheasant, or the pheasant deserts when finding her nest disturbed, or the partridge only lays in already deserted pheasants' nests, I have not been able to ascertain. The laying of eggs in other birds' nests is not a very uncommon practice among several birds; but in such cases it is the earliest layer which sits.

The habit of the partridge which the other interpretation supposes is even more common, or at any rate better known. The following statement was communicated to me by Mr. Riley Fortune, F.L.S., of Harrogate, a well-known ornithologist. 'On the estate of the Earl of Harewood at Plompton . . . they hatched with the pheasants one or two broods of both French (*i.e.* red-leg) and ordinary English partridges. The nests had been cut out when grass cutting at hay-making time, and the eggs taken and hatched out under a fowl. When the birds were hatched, they were taken out into the rearing fields with the pheasants. . . . The hen is put under a coop and her brood of young pheasants or partridges with her; and although the hen is confined, the young birds can run in and out of the coop. In every case were the young partridges enticed away by old partridges; birds, I should say, whose eggs had been taken or destroyed, and who, therefore, had no brood of their own. The maternal instinct was strongly developed, and they enticed away and adopted the young ones from the coop. In some cases they probably had the most right to them.'

Evidence to precisely the same effect had been given to me by another friend, a country squire, who

had for years spent much of his time in studying birds and their habits. He told me that this maternal propensity on the part of the partridge was sometimes a great practical difficulty, as she would try to adopt far more than she could properly manage. It was so well known to keepers that they often let loose a young brood, knowing that they would very soon be found by a foster-mother.

F. H. WOODS.

The New Hebrew Bible of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

THE connexion in which my name is mentioned in the article under the above title written for the issue of April by my friend Professor Eb. Nestle (see p. 314, l. 1), and in the *Times* for 27th January, by the B.F.B.S., compels me to give here the simple facts.

As early as the summer of 1906, Dr. Chr. D. Ginsburg asked my assistance in the printing of a new edition of the Hebrew Bible. In compliance with his request, I gave a good many suggestions, *e.g.* to omit the numberless and useless Raphe-lines. I also compared the whole text of the printed Hebrew Bible with the first massoretical edition of Jakob ben Chayyim (Venice, 1524-1525) and, in many places, with the Mantua Bible (commentary of Shelomo Norzi) and the Halle Bible, adding not a few remarks of my own. This annotated copy I made the property of the B.F.B.S. And I was willing also to read a revise.

Notwithstanding my having asked for it, I did not receive Dr. Ginsburg's manuscript. Therefore, in the month of July 1907, I found myself obliged to write to Mr. Morrison, the Director (B.F.B.S.), and I quote here the substance of my second letter to him:

I understand from your letter that the Rev. Mr. Sharp does not see that it is necessary for me to have Dr. Ginsburg's manuscript, and that Dr. Ginsburg says it is not necessary. Hence I shall 'compare Dr. Ginsburg's corrected proofs with the revised proofs,' and notice the faults which I may happen to find while reading the text of the proofs. With . . .

Of course I did more than I was expected to do by the Rev. Mr. Sharp and Dr. Ginsburg. In almost every sheet I corrected some mistakes overlooked by the first two readers, and I often called the editor's attention to doubtful points.

But I have no responsibility either for the correctness of the text or for the *apparatus criticus*, as my views about the arrangement of the latter have not been attended to. I agree with Professor Nestle that, considering the amount of labour and money expended, the results might have been greater. (By way of parenthesis, I wish to say that the bad misprint *ziline*, Gn 50⁷ [not 49⁷, as Professor Nestle gives], has crept into the text since I revised it.)

As to the Rev. E. W. Bullinger's letter (*Times*, 30th January), all I shall say here is that whilst Dr. Ginsburg was communicating with me I was confident that he was quite entitled, both legally and morally, to offer the manuscript of his new edition of the Hebrew Bible to the B.F.B.S.

HERMANN L. STRACK.

Berlin.

The Last Supper not a Passover Meal.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April, Dr. Milligan draws attention to this question, and to the bearing on it of notes in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1908, by Professor Burkitt and Mr. Brooke, and October 1908, by Mr. Box. May I refer your readers to my *St. Matthew*, pp. 269-274, for an endeavour to show that the Last Supper was a meal eaten on Thursday, Nisan 12, two days before the Passover on Saturday, Nisan 14, and that St. Mark has misrepresented his sources when he identifies the Last Supper with the Passover. With regard to the point made by Mr. Box and Professor Burkitt that Lk 22^{15, 16} imply an unfulfilled desire, it is indeed *possible* that the words bore this meaning in St. Luke's source, but St. Luke himself must surely have understood them to refer to the meal at which they were uttered. For in 22⁷ he has: 'And there came the day of unleavened bread, on which it was necessary to sacrifice the passover'; and in 22¹³, 'and they made ready the passover.' In these clauses he follows Mark with his erroneous [?] identification of the Last Supper with the Passover. But,

in view of these clauses, it is hardly possible that so careful a writer as St. Luke should immediately have added v.¹⁵ if he had not supposed that it could be interpreted to refer to the Passover meal which, according to vv.^{7, 13}, our Lord was then eating.

If this is so, we have on one side St. John and the source of St. Mark, and possibly the source of Lk 22¹⁵, whilst on the other stand St. Mark himself followed by the editor of the First Gospel and by St. Luke.

WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN.

Egerton Hall, Manchester.

A Man under Authority.

IN reference to your notes on Canon Carnegie's interpretation of the faith of the centurion, may I point out that he is not the first to offer this suggestion. In my *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, pp. 192-193, I have said: 'The centurion confesses himself a man *under* as well as *in* authority. He ascribes to Jesus an authority over disease, but does not he also suggest that even He is under authority, and can exercise it only as He submits to it? While He can command disease, and it will obey Him, yet He Himself is under a command to do the work among Jews, being Himself a Jew. Any favour He may show a Gentile is admitted to be exceptional, and it is shown how it need not involve any setting aside of the necessary restrictions of His ministry. . . . What Jesus so warmly praised was such insight into the conditions and limitations under which He had to do His work.'

May I add that this is only one of many interpretations, different from those generally current, to which I have been led on an independent study of the Gospels for the purpose which the book is intended to serve?

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

New College, London.

The Ears of Corn.

MR. BÜCHLER's suggested explanation of Mt 12⁶ may possibly be true as a fact, but it overlooks an important element in the complaint of the Pharisees. There was a double offence in the case. The ears were plucked and eaten on what Luke calls τῷ σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ, that is, the Sabbath falling

in the Passover week. The act was therefore a transgression not only of the Sabbath law, but of the law of first-fruits. Next day the first ripe ears were to be cut and presented in the temple. The corn was therefore at the moment 'taboo.' This explains the apparently irrelevant citation of David's eating of the shewbread, also 'taboo.' 'A greater than the temple is here' seems to imply that the corn had been waved in His presence—the first-fruits divinely dedicated by their service of Him.

ALEXANDER BROWN.

Aberdeen.

The Name of God in Genesis.

I.

I SHOULD be glad if any of your readers could throw light on a question that appears to be of considerable importance to the critical view of the Hexateuch.

Since the days of Astruc, Ex 6³, taken in conjunction with the variations of the Divine appellations in Genesis, has been regarded as affording a clue to the documents of the Pentateuch,—most recently in Dr. Hastings' *New Bible Dictionary*, e.g. p. 288*b*. I find, however, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January 1909, an article by Mr. H. M. Wiener, which adduces evidence to show (1) that the versions do not always support the Massoretic Text in this matter, (2) that the versional variants rest on divergent Hebrew texts and are not due to avoidance of Jahveh by the translators, and (3) that the variants are, in some cases at any rate, demonstrably superior to the readings of the Massoretic Text.

I have failed to find any consideration of these points in the ordinary critical books, and I should therefore be obliged if any of your readers could refer me to a book or article in which these matters are dealt with from the standpoint of those who accept the critical division based on Ex 6³.

A. P. Cox.

Christ Church Vicarage, Cheltenham.

II.

Mr. Cox's question touches on a point of considerable, though not of vital, importance in its bearing on the criticism of the Hexateuch. I do not happen to know of any work which deals exhaustively with the subject from the critical standpoint. I can only try to indicate generally

what I imagine to be the view taken by adherents of the prevalent documentary hypothesis, with regard to the matter under discussion.

1. The existence of the variants is undeniable. It is on the Book of Genesis that the battle of the documents is mainly fought; and in Genesis the Samaritan version differs from the Jewish in (I think) eight cases, and the LXX in 49—about one-sixth of the whole. The other versions do not count for much, being all more or less influenced by the LXX, except Aquila and the Targums, all of which are admittedly founded on the Massoretic Text, while the latter consistently ignore the distinction between *Yahwe* and *Elohim*. These facts were not discovered by Mr. H. M. Wiener, but are the common property of scholars, whether scholars have always given due weight to them or not. It does not on the face of it look as if very much capital could be made of so limited a divergence.

2. It is a fact, however, that the analysis of the Hexateuch has been conducted on the basis of the M.T., and on the assumption that it is more reliable than the LXX. Is that assumption justified? No critic maintains that the M.T. is infallible, or that the LXX is not frequently right when it differs from it. But when it comes to a question of bare fidelity in the transmission of the Divine names, probably no critic would hesitate to say that the presumption is in favour of the M.T. For one thing, it is, in the overwhelming majority of cases, supported by the Samaritan. For another, it is reasonable to expect that Jewish scribes, to whom *Elohim* was an appellation and *Yahwe* a proper name, should observe the distinction more carefully than the Greek copyists, to whom the difference between 'God' and 'the Lord' meant no more than it does to a modern Englishman. It is significant in this connexion that where M.T. and LXX differ, the cases where 'God' is used for *Yahwe* show an immense preponderance over those where 'Lord' is used for *Elohim*, the preference for the common word being as marked as it is intelligible.

3. The alternation in the Divine names, though it furnished the first clue to the separation of sources, is now but one element (and in the opinion of many critics a very subordinate element) in the analysis of the Hexateuch. The documentary theory does not rest on the isolated fact, yet here we read *Yahwe* and there *Elohim*,

with no assignable reason for the difference except change of authorship ; it rests on the observation that this distinction is associated with a number of other characteristic differences in language, style, point of view, religious tendency, and so on ; it is confirmed by the evidence of duplicate narratives, and by the literary consecutiveness of passages assigned to one source. It is not easy to believe that the clue which led to the discovery of so many affinities, connexions, and diversities was altogether fallacious ; but even if it were proved to be so, it would not be the first time that a wrong clue has led to true results. The discovery of America is none the less a solid achievement because Columbus sailed for India. The critical theory is a hypothesis, whose justification lies in its capacity to co-ordinate all the phenomena of a very intricate problem. Whether the hypothesis is sound or the reverse is not now the question ; but it is clear that it is not invalidated by the demonstration that a few of the facts which it set out to explain are less certain than was imagined. And that is all that Mr. Wiener's arguments can ever accomplish.

JOHN SKINNER.

Westminster College, Cambridge.

Emmaus.

DR. BOEHMER is writing for the *Reformirte Kirchen-Zeitung* a series of papers, 'Aus dem heiligen Lande,' which are most valuable and suggestive. I read them with great interest, and hope he will give us yet several other results of his stay of some months in the Holy Land. But, concerning the article he wrote on 'Emmaus' in the January number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I must confess that he seems to have insufficiently grasped the difficulties of the question. I am especially struck by the fact that he does not mention at all that, on the testimony of Josephus (*B.J.* vii. vi. 6), Vespasian established a colony of 800 Roman veterans, and gave them lands, at a place called Emmaus, at a distance from Jerusalem of 60 furlongs (or, according to another lesson, 30 furlongs). This fact shows that the Maccabæan Emmaus is not the only one which has to be taken into consideration, and that the scholars who favour Koloniyeh have a stronger support for their opinion than the motive Dr. Boehmer ascribes to them.

I do not myself claim as a certainty, or even as a strong probability, that Koloniyeh is St. Luke's Emmaus. I had the opportunity of considering the whole subject in my article 'Emmaus,' in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, and my conclusion was, and is still, that we have 'to declare the problem unsolved and incapable of solution under the present conditions and with the data which we possess.' I gave there also a list of the very abundant literature on Emmaus. With the only exception of two or three Italian books, which I was unable to procure, I may say that I have perused or consulted all that has been published on the question ; and I had also formerly visited the different localities which are proposed as representing the Emmaus of St. Luke. Dr. Boehmer seems to me to undervalue the importance of the argument of textual criticism, showing that the original reading of Luke 24¹³ is '60 furlongs,' and not '160' (cf. Lagrange, *Rev. Bibl.*, 1896, pp. 87-92). Several authors, especially Schiffrers, have advocated the view that the words, 'It is drawing towards evening, and the day is already on the decline,' mean simply that midday is past, just as Dr. Boehmer suggests, 'according to the modern usage of natives of Palestine.' However, the whole of the narrative becomes somewhat enigmatic when one tries to imagine the disciples travelling twice seven hours on that day ; their meeting with Jesus and their arrival in Jerusalem at a time when the apostles are still assembled are certainly difficult to realize on that supposition. I do not know whether Dr. Boehmer knows a curious little pamphlet, published at Stettin, 1905, by Aimée Duc, *Die Emmaus-Frage (Auch eine Kritik der reinen Vernunft)*. The author (a man or a woman?) seems to be a German, although wearing a French name or pseudonym, and has lived in Jerusalem. The booklet is not scientific, but nevertheless it is very instructive, and shows the influence which rivalities of different monastic orders may have on the position and the solution of problems which ought to be high above that sort of considerations. Of course Dr. Boehmer, who is a Protestant pastor and a thorough scholar, is entirely foreign to such motives ; but the atmosphere of Jerusalem is saturated with them, and perhaps it is not useless to advise travellers to be cautious.

LUCIEN GAUTIER.

Geneva.

Luke xiv. 34 f.

IN vol. xvii. 191 of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, K. Lake pointed out (not for the first time, as he believed; see *Resch, Agrapha* (1889), p. 425) that Origen's identification of the unnamed disciple who accompanied Cleopas, with 'Peter' presupposes the reading λέγοντες for λέγοντας in v.³⁴, which is actually preserved by Codex D and recommended by Wellhausen.

The same identification is attested to in the Commentary to Isaiah, ascribed to Basilus (ed. Garnerius, i. p. 516): τοιούτω πρὸς Κλεόπα καὶ Σίμωνος ἐκαίετο ἡ καρδιά, ὅτε διήνοιγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Κύριος τὰς γραφάς.

Quem locum forte primus observo, says J. S. Semler, in his appendix to J. J. Wetstenii, *Prolegomena in N.T.* (Halae, 1754, p. 614). Semler explains this identification in another way than Lake, namely, by a confusion of Ἀμαων with Σίμων. This is probably wrong, but attention may be called to the passage, as Plummer in his Commentary does not even mention the reading λέγοντες.

But did Origen think of Peter, as Lake and Resch suppose? Origen says always (at least five times, not only twice as Plummer says; see the passages quoted by Resch) Σίμων, and he may have thought of the son of Kleophas, the second bishop of Jerusalem (Συμεῶνα τὸν τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, Eusebius, *H.E.*, 3, 32, i.).

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Luke xi. 27.

PLUMMER quotes from Edersheim (*L. and T.*, ii. p. 201) a Rabbinical passage: 'Blessed is the hour in which the Messiah was created; blessed the womb whence He issued; blessed the generation that sees Him; blessed the eye that is worthy to behold Him.'

Much nearer is the saying quoted by Dalman in his *Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (§ 57, various phrases):

תתברכן דדיא דהבין אונקין
ומעיא דהבין אפיקו

'blessed the breasts which gave suckle to such a one, and the womb that such a one brought forth.' This saying (from BerR. 98), with its rhyme or assonance between 'ḏniq and 'appiq, reminds of the

assonance between *ragged* and 'arged ('weeping' and 'dancing,' Lk 7³²) if retranslated into Aramaic.

Maulbronn.

EB. NESTLE.

The Origin of the Term 'Synoptic.'

In a collection of photographs of MSS of the N.T., formerly in the possession of Dean Burgon, and now in the library of the Literary and Philosophical Society at Halifax, there is the first page of a minuscule MS. of St. Luke, dated 1107, with the following for the first words of the title:

EUCUNΘWFITON

If this contraction may by possibility be deciphered as

εὐαγγέλιον συνθεώμενον τρίτον

we have a most interesting anticipation, by six or seven centuries, of the use of the term 'Synoptic.'

Halifax.

HENRY T. HOOPER.

The Hour of the Crucifixion.

MRS. GIBSON'S interesting note in the January number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has not provoked any comment in the February issue. May I therefore be allowed to point out that her alternative reading in Jn 19¹⁴ was already known to Dr. Hort, and rejected by him? He, as well as Mrs. Gibson, mentions Eusebius's statement in his letter to Marinus, and gives the authorities which read τρίτη instead of ἔκτη; they include ^{nc} and D^{sup}. For ἔκτη are ^{AB}, etc. See his note on p. 90 of the 'Notes on Select Readings,' Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, vol. ii.

West Hatch.

G. E. FFRENCH.

Daniel ix. 26.

וְאֵין לִי

THIS verse reads: 'And after the threescore and two weeks shall an anointed one be cut off, וְאֵין לִי.' The last two Heb. words yield no sense in their present context. The rendering 'but not for himself' (A.V.) is inadmissible, for אֵין contains by implication the substantive verb, which demands a subject. Various exegetes have sought to explain the sentence by supplying 'anything' as subject, so that the meaning would be 'and shall have nothing' (so R.V.). But this is equally in-

admissible, for in the passage before us, unlike Ex 22², the notion of the subject in question is not suggested by the context. The author, it is held, intended to signify that the 'anointed one' had no *legitimate successor*; but it is plain that this idea could not have been suggested in more obscure terms. Hence it has been proposed to emend the text, which may have been more or less seriously exposed to corruption.

The LXX render *καὶ οὐκ ἔσται*. May they not have read *וְאֵין*? The statement would thus be a pleonastic repetition of what is contained in the preceding clause. It is at least more probable that the LXX rendering embodies an attempt to interpret the enigmatic words of our text. Moreover, *וְאֵין* could hardly have been corrupted to *וְאֵין לוֹ*. It follows that Theodotion's rendering, *καὶ κρίμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ*, supplies no solid historical basis for the restoration of the original text. It represents once more simply a conjecture to escape a difficulty, and the same is the case with the paraphrase of the Vulgate: *et non erit ejus populus qui cum negaturus est*. Nevertheless, Theodotion offers a solution which has attracted more exegetes than one. Leaving out of account the condition of the text which Theodotion had before him, is it not a plausible hypothesis that the original text was *וְאֵין דָּן לוֹ* or, still better, *וְאֵין אָן*? It would readily occur that *וְאֵין* or, above all, *אָן* should be omitted by haplography after *וְאֵין*. No doubt. But in the rapid description contained in the verses before us, one does not look for such a comment by the author. Moreover, the emphasis is not

upon the injustice of the attack which proved fatal to the 'anointed one,' but upon the attack itself and the destruction of the 'anointed one,' which was its consequence.

Still more decidedly must we reject the proposal to restore the word *עֵזֶר* after *וְאֵין*, yielding the sense 'and shall have no helper.' A comparison with Dn 11⁴⁵ lends no support to this emendation. The *punishment* of Antiochus Epiphanes *is to consist* partly in the abandonment in which he will be left, but the privation of help would have been a trifling detail, and unnecessary to mention in the sentence before us which announces the destruction of the 'anointed one.'

For a considerable time I have been accustomed to read the difficult words of Dn 9²⁶ in a sense averse to the explanations just mentioned. Perhaps habit blinds me to objections which others may better appreciate. Be that as it may, I have decided, not without hesitation, to submit my interpretation to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In place of *וְאֵין לוֹ*, I propose to read *וְאֵין לוֹי*. The omission of the ' between the ' of *לוֹ* and the initial ' of the following *וְהָעֵר* is, *per se*, readily explainable. Moreover, the sense appears to me to suit the context. After the murder of Onias III. the high priesthood was usurped by Menelaus, *who did not belong to the Levitical order*. Was it not this circumstance that was in the mind of our author, leading him to say: 'And after the threescore and two weeks shall an anointed one be cut off, and Levi is no more'?

Lowvain.

A. VAN HOONACKER.

Entre Nous.

Three Students' Books.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published this month three volumes of the first importance for students of theology. One is an *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, by Professor Geden of Richmond College (8s. 6d. net). The second is on *The Christian Doctrine of God* (10s. 6d.). It is a volume of the 'International Theological Library.' It is written by Professor W. N. Clarke, who is apparently the most popular of all American theological writers at the present day. His *Outline of Christian Theology* has reached its fifteenth edition.

There is no time to review these books this

month. Students will scarcely think it necessary to wait for reviews of them. Professor Geden is a darker horse than Professor Clarke; but he has a good record, and there is little doubt that an Introduction to the Old Testament covering all the departments of Introduction by so practised and conscientious a hand will be widely welcomed. Its place has been vacant for some time.

But the third is the book with originality.

There was in the University of Aberdeen, a good many years ago, a student of the name of Robert Scott, who, as the saying is, carried everything before him. The highest expectations were formed

by class-mates and professors of the work he would do in the world. He has done good work. But he has done it in Bombay, as a Professor in the College there. He has given himself to the laborious task of commending Western culture to Eastern minds. And he has commended it. But he has also given himself to the work of bringing Christ, who came from the East, back to the East again. He has done good work. But few of his class-mates or professors have known it.

They will know now. They will know that what they believed to be in the man was in him. The book he has written is called *The Pauline Epistles: A Critical Study* (6s. net). It is the second volume of that series, entitled 'The Literature of the New Testament,' of which Professor E. F. Scott's volume on *The Fourth Gospel* was the first. Professor E. F. Scott was held to be advanced. Professor Robert Scott will be held to be advanced also. For he takes the Pauline Epistles and assigns them to their authors. Not to St. Paul? Yes, but partly also to Silas, to Luke, to Timothy.

At first it is mere chaos and provocation. But the first impression passes away. The impression that succeeds is admiration for the man's mastery of his subject; and next, astonishment that so new a situation can be made so probable, and that without loss of interest or edification.

Italy.

Here are a few books on Italy, good for the student or the traveller.

1. Macmillan's Guide. The title is *Guide to Italy and Sicily* (10s. net). It covers the whole peninsula. It contains nineteen maps and thirty-six plans. We set Macmillan before Baedeker, because we have no intention of writing a book about Italy, or even a series of articles in the local newspaper. We simply want information, reliable information, on every possible matter of doubt. Our experience is that the hotel prices in Macmillan are marked too low. But we soon cease to trouble the guide book about hotel prices.

2. A Word Book, lest the right word escapes one at the moment or the right turn of a sentence. Riccardo's *English and Italian Dialogues* will do. The phrases are plentiful, and they are the phrases we shall require. Besides, there is a modest Grammar at the end. Hachette is the publisher (1s. 6d.).

3. For the journey there is nothing that will be more easily read or give one a more self-respecting sense of knowing something about the country, than Helen Zimmern's *Italy of the Italians* (Pitman; 6s. net). It is the Italy we shall see, not Dante's, or even John Ruskin's. And it is every side of the Italy of to-day, its literature and its science, as well as its trade and its games. The illustrations are plentiful and lifelike.

4. But we must get an introduction to the Painters. One of the easiest is Mr. Henry Attwell's *Italian Masters* (Sampson Low; 3s. 6d.). Mr. Attwell takes us up just when we have left school, and carries us first to the National Gallery. When we have learned all that he can teach us about the Italian painters there, we are ready to go to Italy.

5. Then we should get Berenson's volume on the *North Italian Painters of the Renaissance* (Putnam; 6s. net). It contains a complete, accurate, and accessible catalogue; and the catalogue is done in two parts, one part following the name of the painter, the other the name of the place. That is the second half of the book. The first half is an historical essay, capable, even masterly, bringing facts into their place in tendencies and development, and bringing the reader into the way of knowing something about Italian painting which will remain with him.

6. Then take the volume in Sir E. J. Poynter's 'Illustrated Art Handbooks.' It is the work of Sir Edward Poynter himself in co-operation with Mr. Percy R. Head. Its title is *Classic and Italian Painting* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d.). In this book the whole ground is covered. And the illustrations are well chosen and plentiful. The volume is bound in leather for wear.

7. After the Paintings take the Churches and Cathedrals. It may not be the scientific order, but it is the path of least resistance. The most satisfactory book is *The Cathedrals and Churches of Modern Italy*, by Mr. T. Francis Bumpus (Werner Laurie). It gives a full enough description of all the great ecclesiastical buildings of the North, and it contains eighty-one illustrations, nine of which are in colour. It is a big book to find room for, but it is not heavy to carry about.

8. Now for a City. And in spite of all the guides and travelling agents, let it be neither Florence nor Venice, but Rome. For a book has

just been published on that part of Rome which at the present moment is the most interesting part. It contains the very latest exploration. It is written by the hand of a master. And it is illustrated, we had almost said lavishly; but that would imply waste, and there is not a useless engraving in it. The book we mean is *The Monuments of Christian Rome*, by Professor Frothingham. It is the latest issue of Macmillan's 'Handbooks of Archæology and Antiquities' (10s. 6d.).

Nothing More.

Simon of Cyrene bore
The cross of Jesus; nothing more.
His name is never heard again,
Nor honoured by historic pen;
Nor on the pedestal of fame
His image courts the loud acclaim.
Simon of Cyrene bore
The cross of Jesus; nothing more.

And yet, when all our work is done,
And golden beams the western sun
Upon a life of wealth and fame,—
A thousand echoes ring the name,—
Perhaps our hearts will humbly pray:
'Good Master, let the record say,
Upon the page divine, "He bore
The cross of Jesus"; nothing more.'

ARTHUR B. RHINOW.

A Preacher's Authority.

Is it not an old-fashioned way of speaking? No, a preacher may have authority still. Not because he is a man in authority. That is the old-fashioned way. But because he is a man under authority.

That is also an old-fashioned way, the oldest way of all, the way of Amos and Jeremiah. They were not men in authority; but they were men under authority, saying what they said, because the word of the Lord was a fire in their bones, and doing what they did because they could do no other.

Now, to be under authority is simply, as we have seen, to say always, 'Not my will, but Thine be done.' Professor A. S. Hoyt of Auburn Theological Seminary has published a book on *The Preacher* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). It is a thoroughly modern book. It discusses everything—the preacher's person, the preacher's message, and the preacher's method; and all with much wealth of illustration and much wisdom of words. It discusses the authority of the preacher. 'An

old Scotch minister,' says Dr. Hoyt, 'touched the heart of the matter, when he said in a charge to a young man: "The great purpose for which a minister is settled in a parish is not to cultivate scholarship, or to visit the people during the week, or even to preach to them on Sunday; but it is to live among them as a good man, whose mere presence is a demonstration that cannot be gainsaid, that there is a life possible on earth which is fed from no earthly source, and that the things spoken of in church on Sundays are realities."'

And ran.

'Aristotle said that "the magnificent man" never runs; but, says Jesus, when the prodigal son was yet a great way off "his father saw him, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him." This contrast measures the distance between Jesus' idea of God and some theologies which their creators have called Christian.'¹

Children.

This is going to be *The Century of the Child*. So says Mrs. Ellen Key, who writes a book about it and gives her book that title (Putnam). And the first thing that the child is to insist upon in the new century is the right to choose its own parents. That is to say, the right to ask the State to see to it that its parents are physically fit and of sufficient age to marry. 'The conditions of a strong, well-nourished offspring require the postponement of the marriage age for women. In northern countries it should be established, if not by law at least by custom, at about twenty years. Then the young woman can have behind her some years of careless youthful joy, an undisturbed self-development, and will also have reached the physical development necessary for motherhood.'

Mrs. Key believes that women can be made almost anything that the State pleases. Burne-Jones created the new English type of woman. English girls looked at his pictures and adapted themselves to the quiet distinguished style. They cut their clothes in the fashion of the master's pictures. And becoming mothers they passed on the type to their children, who developed it yet more strikingly. Mrs. Key has a chapter on Education. She does not believe in punishment. 'Children who strike back when they are punished have the most promising characters of all.' She

¹ T. R. Glover, in *The British Friend*, Jan. 1909, p. 5.

does not believe in telling a child to beg pardon, or to adopt any other attitude at command. 'A small child once had been rude to his elder brother and was placed upon a chair to repent his fault. After a time the mother asked if he was sorry. "Yes," he answered with emphasis. But there was a mutinous sparkle in his eyes. "Sorry for what?" she asked. "Sorry that I did not call him a liar besides."'

Abba.

"In His will is our peace," wrote the great Christian poet of the Middle Ages. "Doing the will we find rest," said a humble Christian of the second century, whose very name is lost. They both learnt the thought from Jesus, who set it in the prayer, beginning with *Abba*, which He taught His disciples; and who prayed it Himself in the garden with the same word *Abba* in His heart.¹

Books Wanted and Offered.

Books wanted to buy, and books offered for sale, will be inserted free, but the Editor will exercise his judgment as to their insertion. A stamp for re-posting must be sent with every offer to buy or sell. All correspondence must be direct to the Editor's address, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland, not to the publishing offices. It must be understood if no reply is received that a previous offer has been accepted.

BOOKS OFFERED.

- Swete's St. Mark, 2nd ed., as new, 9s. 6d.
- Latimer's Sermons, 1607, calf, in excellent condition.
- God's Witness to His Word, by H. D. Brown, 2s.
- Gibbon's Rome, 'World's Classics,' 7 vols., 3s. 6d.
- Mahaffy's Empire of the Ptolemies, 1895, published 12s. 6d., uncut 4s. 6d.
- Mozley's Bampton Lectures on Miracles, 3rd ed., 2s. 6d.
- Leviticus and Numbers, by Genung, and Jeremiah, by Brown, in American Com. on O.T., 2s. each.
- Tales of Troy and Greece, by Andrew Lang, new, 4s. 6d. net for 2s. 6d.
- Venture of Rational Faith, by Margaret Benson, 1908, (pub. 6s. net), 2s. 6d.
- Hugh Macmillan's Spring of the Day, 1907, new, 2s.
- Moulton's Grammar of New Testament Greek, 2nd ed., 4s. 6d.
- Hort's Apocalypse of St. John, 1908, 3s.

BOOKS WANTED.

- Watson's Lectures on 1 John.
- Matthew's Bible.
- Taverner's Bible.

¹ T. R. Glover, *ibid.* p. 6.

- Concordance to Spenser's Poems.
- Hume's Philosophical Works.
- Fraser's Edition of Berkeley.
- Plummer's Bede.
- Hodgkin's Italy and her Invaders, vols. 7 and 8.
- Cults of the Greek States. By Farnell.
- Herbert Spencer's Works.
- T. H. Green's Philosophical Works.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by Miss Smart, Poona, India, to whom a copy of Thomson's *The Bible of Nature* has been sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for June must be received by the 1st of May. The text is Rev 1¹⁷. 18.

The Great Text for July is Rev 2⁷—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God.' A copy of Adeney's *Greek and Eastern Churches* or of Rutherford's *Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 2¹⁰—'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.' A copy of Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' Series will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for September is Rev 2¹⁷—'To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it.' A copy of Dr. Robert Scott's *The Pauline Epistles* or of Dr. W. G. Jordan's *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for October is Rev 3²⁰—'Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.' A copy of Law's *The Tests of Life* or of Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister* will be sent for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.